

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JANUARY, 1892.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR,
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLXXV

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, AND GREEN, LONDON;
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1892.

CONTENTS OF No. 359.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Correspondance Diplomatique du Comte Pozzo di Borgo. Par le Comte Charles Pozzo di Borgo. Paris: 1890.	
2. Pozzo di Borgo. Par le Vicomte Adrien Maggiolo. Paris: 1890.	1
II.—The Badminton Library: Riding and Polo. By Captain Robert Weir and J. Moray Brown, with contributions by the Duke of Beaufort, &c. London: 1891,	34
III.—1. The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ. Translated from the German of John J. I. Dollinger by N. Daniell, M.A. 2 vols. London: 1862.	
2. The First Age of Christianity and the Church. By J. I. von Dollinger. Translated by H. N. Oxenham. Third Edition. London: 1877.	
3. Akademische Vorträge. Von J. von Dollinger. 3 Bände. München: 1888-1891.	
4. Studies in European History. (A Translation of Vol. 1. of the preceding work.) Translated by M. Warre. London: 1890.	
5. Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters. Von Ign. v. Dollinger. Zweite Auflage. 1890.	
6. Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Era. By Ign. v. Dollinger. Translated by A. Plummer. London: 1873.	
7. Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees. By Ign. v. Dollinger. Authorised Translation. Edinburgh: 1890.	
8. Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches. By Ign. v. Dollinger. Translated by H. N. Oxenham. London: 1872.	
9. Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters. Von I. v. Dollinger. 2 Bände. München: 1890.	
10. Geschichte der Moraltreugkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche seit dem XVI. Jahrhundert. Bearbeitet von Ign. v. Dollinger und F. H. Reusch. 2 Bände. 1890.	

CONTENTS.

	Page
11. Ignaz von Döllinger: <i>Erinnerungen</i> . Von Luise von Kobell. München: 1891.	
12. Recollections of Dr. Döllinger. By A. Plummer, in Vols. I. and II. of the <i>Expositor</i> , Series IV. 1890,	48
IV.—The Elements of Politics. By Henry Sidgwick, Author of 'The Methods of Ethics,' and 'The Principles of Political Economy.' London: 1891,	84
V.— <i>Mémoires du Général Baron de Marbot</i> . Tomes I., II. Paris: 1891,	114
VI.—1. Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England. Edited by Sir Harris Nicolas. Published under the direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records. 7 vols. 1834–37.	
2. Acts of the Privy Council of England. Edited by John Roche Dasent. Published by direction of the Lord President of the Council and the Master of the Rolls. 3 vols. 1890–91,	145
VII.—1. English Men of Action: Rodney. By David Hannay. London: 1891.	
2. The Sea Service. By Commander C. N. Robinson, R.N. Illustrated by W. H. Overend. London: 1891.	
3. The Official Catalogue of the Royal Naval Exhibition, 1891,	166
VIII.—The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon. The Story as told by the Imperial Ambassador resident at the Court of Henry VIII. <i>In usum laicorum</i> . By J. A. Froude. Being a supplementary volume to the Author's 'History of England.' 8vo. London: 1891,	201
IX.—1. Mahdism and the Egyptian Sudan. By Major F. R. Wingate, F.S.O., R.A., A.A.G. Egyptian Army. London: 1891,	
2. The Ruin of the Soudan. By Henry Russell and William Gattie. London: 1892,	232
X.—1. Speech of the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., at Plymouth. August 10, 1891.	
2. Speech of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., at Newcastle. October 2, 1891.	
3. Speeches of the Duke of Argyll and Lord Hartington at Manchester. November 10, 1891,	274

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1892.

N^o. CCCLIX.

ART. I.—1. *Correspondance Diplomatique du Comte Pozzo di Borgo.* Par le Comte CHARLES POZZO DI BORGO. Paris: 1890.

2. *Pozzo di Borgo.* Par le Vicomte ADRIEN MAGGIOLO. Paris: 1890.

THE island of Corsica, with a population of less than a quarter of a million, produced, nearly at the same time, two of the most remarkable men among those who played leading parts in the great events of the closing years of the last and the early years of the present century: the one was Napoleon Bonaparte, the other Charles André Pozzo di Borgo, the great Russian diplomatist, whose official correspondence during a few eventful years is now being given to the public by his nephew. Almost simultaneously a Life of him by the Vicomte Maggiolo gives the most complete account yet published of his career, and shows how great was the influence that he exercised over the foreign policy of both Russia and France, especially during the years from the first restoration of the Bourbons in 1814 to their fall in 1830. The dream of his diplomatic life was to bring about an alliance between the two Powers, and in the pursuit of it he did not allow himself to be troubled by any inconvenient scruples about the morality of the means by which it was to be effected, nor by regard for the interests or rights of any other nation. The Russian Government is perhaps the only one which, without ever losing sight of an object it has once determined to attain, knows how to wait and to bide its time, desisting, when necessary, from its immediate pursuit, while watching for a favourable opportunity for taking it up again; and everything that throws light upon the basis on which it was proposed to

found the alliance in the past helps to show what may be expected if it should be attempted in the future.

Count Pozzo's family was one of the oldest and most considerable of Corsica. At the time of his birth in 1764 the struggle to shake off the yoke of the Republic of Genoa had long been going on under the leadership of the great patriot Pasquale Paoli, and the Pozzo di Borgos were among the foremost of their countrymen in the cause of independence, which had been practically achieved when, in 1768, the Genoese Government, recognising their inability to reduce the island to submission, sold their asserted rights over it to King Louis XVI. of France. Charles André Pozzo di Borgo, being born four years earlier, was thus entitled in after life to boast that he had been 'born free,' while his great countryman and contemporary Napoleon, who was no less anxious to be considered as born a Frenchman, gave 1769 as the year of his own birth, a date the accuracy of which has been much questioned. The Bonapartes, like the Pozzo di Borgos, had been energetic partisans of Paoli, and, although they were of a much lower social position, a close intimacy sprang up between the two families. Charles André was the friend and constant companion of Joseph and Napoleon Bonaparte, and in his memoirs he describes their characters at that time, when they were all mere lads. Joseph, he says, was the gentler of the two, while Napoleon had more vivacity and *emportement* in his actions and in his manners; but it was with him, the younger brother, that it was necessary to count in the small matters arising between them, which makes it difficult to suppose that, however great his precocity, there can have been as much as five and a half years difference in their ages.

When the Corsicans, who flattered themselves that they had achieved their independence, found themselves handed over to the French king without their consent or knowledge, their indignation and anger knew no bounds, and Paoli and his friends, among whom the most energetic was Charles Bonaparte, the father of Joseph and Napoleon, resolved to oppose the French as they had opposed the Genoese; but they could not offer effectual resistance to the forces sent against them, and after a brief struggle they were overpowered, Paoli himself being obliged to fly and take refuge in England. The new Government, however, interfered little with existing usages and customs, and was altogether administered with so much consideration that the people were gradually reconciled to it, and Count Pozzo's father,

a former champion of the independence, became a member of the Council of Twelve under the French governor. Everything went on peaceably and well till the breaking out of the French Revolution produced in Corsica the same agitation that it had provoked in every other part of the kingdom, and two parties arose in the island. The one, having at its head the governor and public functionaries, wished to oppose it; the other, adopting the new ideas, was enthusiastically in favour of accepting the decrees of the National Assembly and the tricolour cockade.

The magical word 'liberty,' which was constantly in the mouth of the revolutionists, had an irresistible attraction for the Corsicans, and it was no sooner pronounced in the island than the people clamoured for the return of General Paoli, who was recalled from his exile by a decree of the National Assembly, and the town of Ajaccio deputed Charles André Pozzo and Joseph Bonaparte to go to meet and escort him back to Bastia, where Napoleon was one of the first to welcome him.

'Paoli on his own authority,' says Count Pozzo in his memoirs, 'proceeded to convoke a meeting, open to everyone, at the Convent of Orezza. The convent and the valley were filled with armed men coming from every canton, and the General proposed and the meeting decided that a petition should be sent to the National Assembly asking that Corsica should be declared an integral part of France and constituted a Department, and that two delegates should be chosen to present a petition to this effect to the Assembly.'

On Paoli's suggestion Gentili, a veteran of the struggle for independence, and the young Charles André Pozzo di Borgo were elected as the delegates. They proceeded to Paris and presented the petition at the bar of the National Assembly, which, after an eloquent speech by Mirabeau in support of it, unanimously passed a decree in conformity with its demands. After that Count Pozzo says:—

'I passed five months at Paris, attending the sittings of the Assembly and cultivating the remarkable men of the time. Mirabeau encouraged me much to go to him, and I sometimes dined with him. I was intensely interested in what I saw and heard. I shared the doctrines of the day, in the belief that they would only lead us to reforms, but not to revolution. I went sometimes to the meetings of the Jacobins, which disgusted me by the triviality, exaggeration, and bad taste that reigned in them.'

After the dissolution of the Constituent Pozzo was elected as one of the Corsican deputies to the Legislative Assembly, which he describes as consisting of the Girondins, who wished

for power and the Republic, of the Jacobins, who wanted the Republic and popular tyranny, and of the Moderates, who were in favour of a constitutional monarchy, with which last, as 'morally and politically the least bad,' he was in the habit of voting, and he was present at the sitting of the fatal August 10, when the King and the Royal Family were arrested. A National Convention was convoked; but, disheartened and discouraged by all he had seen, he wrote to Corsica to decline a nomination to it, and after remaining a short time longer in Paris, and becoming a silent spectator of the proclamation of the Republic, he returned home.

On his arrival in Corsica Paoli, who received him with the affection of a father, questioned him closely on the state of France, and was confirmed by his answers in the belief that not only France but Europe was about to go through a crisis which might disturb the whole world. He saw and appreciated the general danger, but in the isolated position of Corsica his first care was to see to the safety and tranquillity of his native island and to watch the developement of events on the Continent without becoming the victim of them. He decided to submit to the decrees of the Convention, without, however, putting in force the most oppressive of their dispositions, and although it was determined, while waiting for better days, to carry on the government according to the new forms, the confiscation of the small properties left behind by the Corsican *émigrés*, who were few in number, was not enforced. The friendship that had subsisted between the Pozzos di Borgo and the Bonapartes had for some time been on the wane, and was soon to be followed by the animosity which lasted to the fall of the French Empire. Napoleon had resented the election of Charles André as deputy to the Legislative Assembly in preference to his own brother Joseph, and he was still further irritated when, through the influence of Paoli, his nomination as 'Procureur Général Syndic' gave him the most important of the ministerial functions and made him virtually the governor of the island. But the Bonapartes had not yet openly broken with Paoli, though they associated with the Jacobins, and frequented the Jacobin club founded at Ajaccio in connexion with those of Toulon, Marseilles, and Paris.

While the Reign of Terror in France filled the prisons with 'suspects,' and established the guillotine in permanence, a moderate and conciliatory administration kept Corsica in a state of comparative tranquillity; for the Corsicans, though devoted to freedom, for which they had always

been ready to shed their blood, were not revolutionists of the French type, Saliceti alone of their deputies to the Convention having voted for the death of the King. But though Paoli and Pozzo were undoubtedly acting in unison with the wishes of the great bulk of their countrymen in making it their aim to save the island from the Terror, the task proved beyond their strength. The Jacobin clubs denounced them to the National Convention, which sent three commissioners to Corsica with unlimited powers, the regicide and terrorist Saliceti being one of them. Saliceti, on his arrival, had an interview with Pozzo, who describes it in his Memoirs.

‘We could not understand or trust each other: his plan was to instal the Terror in Corsica, mine to do nothing extraordinary—to preserve the peace of the island without quarrelling (*sans nous brouiller*) with France, and still less separating from her, republic as she was; and to wait for the end of the crisis, which was too violent to last. General Paoli advocated this system without any *arrière-pensée* either of independence or of submission to the English.’

Things were in this state when, at the instigation of Lucien Bonaparte, the National Convention passed a decree in which the names of Paoli and Pozzo di Borgo were included in a list of the persons to be proscribed, the spirit that actuated him being betrayed by an intercepted letter from him to his brothers announcing the decree in the triumphant words, ‘Paoli e Pozzo decretati e la nostra fortuna fatta,’ which, when the services of the former to their common country are considered, offers a scarcely credible example of the unscrupulous self-seeking of the Bonaparte family. When the decree of the National Convention, which was equivalent to a sentence of death, was known, a perfect storm of indignation arose throughout the island, for Paoli was a national hero, adored by the whole people, and the citation addressed to him and Pozzo by Saliceti and the two other commissioners was responded to by a summons from the General Council convoking deputies from all the communes to meet ‘to save the country from anarchy and to demand the revocation of the decree.’ Above a thousand deputies, furnished with full powers from their communes, presented themselves at the place of meeting, accompanied by an enthusiastic host of followers; they invited the attendance of Paoli and Pozzo, who declared their readiness either to resist or to leave the country, according to the decision of the meeting, upon which, with a burst of universal acclamation, every man present swore to defend them to

the last. Paoli was confirmed in his title of Generalissimo and Father of the Country, while Pozzo was declared to have deserved well of the country and maintained in his position as Procureur Général Syndic, and it was resolved that an address should be sent to the Convention to set forth the state of affairs. The next day the text of the address was voted, the powers of the Conventional commissioners were declared null and those of the provincial administrations confirmed, and Paoli was ordered to see to the defence of the country and to resist any hostile invasion. There was still no thought of throwing off the connexion with France, and the address declared 'that the people of the Department of Corsica, faithful to their oaths and to their promises, persist in their union with the French Republic, but always free and unoppressed.'

The next day the Conventional commissioners made an attack on Ajaccio with a frigate, a corvette, two gunboats, and transports, but, after five days of fruitless efforts, were obliged to abandon the enterprise and to re-embark their troops, which were under the command of Napoleon Bonaparte, who went first to join his family at Calvi and thence proceeded to France. He was soon followed by Saliceti, upon whose report the Convention pronounced Paoli and Pozzo di Borgo, together with a number of the most considerable citizens of Corsica, traitors to the Republic and *hors la loi*, and when this decree reached the island another general assembly was called. It expressed its horror of the system of violence and rapine that was attempted to be enforced upon the Corsicans, and especially of the persecution and the destruction of all religion, and ended by pronouncing the dissolution of every connexion with France, declaring Corsica a monarchical State, of which the constitution would be elaborated by a national assembly, and offering the sovereignty to George III., King of Great Britain, on condition of his swearing to respect the liberties of the country. The offer having been favourably entertained in London, Sir Gilbert Elliot, afterwards Lord Minto, and Lord Hood, commanding the Mediterranean squadron, arrived in Corsica, in January 1794, as commissioners from the British Government, with full powers to make the necessary arrangements; but little could be done at first, as the French, though driven by the people from the country districts, still held the strong positions of Bastia, Calvi, and San Fiorenzo, and Lord Hood concluded a convention with Paoli agreeing that the British forces should assist the Corsicans in ex-

elling them. The operations were, however, protracted by misunderstandings between the naval and military commanders, the latter refusing for a long time to co-operate in the bolder plans of attack advocated by Lord Hood and Nelson, which, when ultimately adopted, led to the capture of Bastia, the last of the French strongholds. Immediately after this event Sir G. Elliot, who had received his commission as viceroy, formally announced the King's acceptance of the crown and sovereignty of the island, and in his Majesty's name took the oath, solemnly promising to respect the constitution and the liberties of the Corsican people.

Sir Gilbert, on his arrival, had met with the most cordial reception from Paoli, whom he found old and much broken in health, and protesting that his only wish was to retire into private life after seeing tranquillity and a good government established in the island; but in his earliest letters to his Government the viceroy expressed some doubt whether, when it came to the point, a man who had played so great a part would willingly descend to a second place, and in this he was not mistaken. The British Government, moreover, did nothing to conciliate Paoli or to keep him in good humour, but treated him with entire neglect, seeming to ignore his very existence. It was he who had given the crown of Corsica to the King, and it was not unnatural that he should be both hurt and indignant when he did not receive from his Majesty's ministers one word of acknowledgement for his services or of hope that he would continue to exert his vast influence over his countrymen in consolidating the new order of things. He had, moreover, entertained the hope of being himself appointed viceroy—an arrangement which the British Government obviously could not sanction—and, when another was nominated to that post, his resentment was at once made manifest and his attitude altogether changed.

He withdrew from all public business, remaining at home brooding over fancied wrongs, and, although the first parliament called under the new constitution at once elected him president and voted that his bust should be placed in the chamber, he would not appear within its walls even on the occasion of its installation, and he became jealous of and estranged from the best of his former friends. Sir G. Elliot had quickly recognised the talents and great capacity for business of Pozzo di Borgo, who, proving himself an admirable coadjutor in carrying on the administration, became the right hand of the viceroy, as he had before been that of

Paoli, and from that time dates the lasting friendship that was established between them. But Paoli bitterly resented what he considered the desertion of his former lieutenant by the transfer to another of the allegiance he thought due to himself alone, and Pozzo was deeply pained by the accusation. He loved and venerated Paoli as a father, and his affectionate and generous nature never allowed him under any provocation, either at the time or later, to speak of his old leader otherwise than in the terms of the regard and respect which he said was due to him from every Corsican.

Paoli after a time became the centre around which all the malcontents rallied, causing much embarrassment to the Government, till he was induced to accept an invitation from the King to proceed to England with a pension of 3,000*l.* a year, which he received during the remaining years of his life; but the spirit of disaffection he had done so much to arouse continued after his departure.

The extraordinary successes of Napoleon in his Italian campaign had encouraged the partisans of France; he was threatening an expedition against Sardinia, the capture of which would render precarious the position of Corsica, where many of the people were dazzled by the exploits of their countryman, while the British Government, deaf to repeated remonstrances, though giving no hint of abandoning the island, did nothing to strengthen its means of defence against a serious attack. The viceroy's letters had been left unread, and lay unopened on the Duke of Portland's table, and it was with no less surprise than mortification that in October 1797 he received peremptory orders for an immediate evacuation, which he had no choice but to obey. No sooner, however, had they been sent off than the Government bethought themselves of the unopened letters, and having read them repented their decision, and in all haste despatched fresh orders countermanding the first. They naturally arrived too late, and when they reached Corsica the last of the troops were already embarked on board the transports. Napoleon, informed of the preparations for the evacuation of the island, at once sent a force under General Gentili to take possession, and took the opportunity of indulging in the animosity with which he pursued Pozzo di Borgo to the end of his reign by giving that officer specific orders to exclude him from the general amnesty that was to be proclaimed.

This closed for ever Pozzo's connexion with his native island, of which he had conducted the administration with

great ability at a very difficult period, and with unshaken loyalty to the British viceroy, whose esteem he ever after retained. He proceeded to England, and never saw Corsica again; for although his heart remained true to the land of his birth he could not visit it while the Empire lasted, and after the Restoration he never had a moment's leisure. Arriving in London a proscribed fugitive, unknown and without resources of his own, his situation would have been far from enviable if it had not been for the friendship and liberal assistance of Sir G. Elliot, by this time created Lord Minto, to which in after years, when at the height of prosperity and distinction, he frequently referred in terms of grateful acknowledgement. Lord Minto was one of the most prominent politicians of the day, and the eminent men in whose intimacy he lived, and to whom Pozzo was introduced by him, were not slow in perceiving his unusual abilities, while his genial character and brilliant conversational talents soon made him universally welcome in society, and gave him a leading place among the *émigrés* belonging to the first French families who were then collected in London.

When, in 1799, Lord Minto was sent as Envoy Extraordinary to Vienna, he invited Pozzo to accompany him, and treated him as a member of his own family as long as he remained. This determined Pozzo's future career; although he had no official position, it initiated him in the diplomatic transactions of the day, which he followed with all the enthusiasm of his nature, and he was thoroughly absorbed in foreign politics long before he had any official connexion with them. At Vienna, as in London, he quickly became intimate with the Prince de Ligne, Prince Adam Czartoryski, and others of the same distinction, with whom he discussed the affairs of Europe. But the freedom with which he developed his own views, and probably criticised the equivocal policy of Austria, provoked the authorities to proceed to his expulsion, which was averted only by the prompt interposition of Lord Minto, who, not being able to claim for him the privileges of a member of his legation, appealed to the Emperor in his favour.

After this, however, he seems not to have considered it advisable to remain in Vienna, and towards the end of 1800 he returned to England, where he renewed his relations with the French *émigrés*, who, like himself, were hoping for the restoration of the royal family. Pozzo must be regarded at this time in the light of a political adventurer, anxious,

as his admiring biographer states, to 'retrouver à la fois une patrie et un champ d'action.' Action was, in fact, what he panted for, and he was ready to make a 'patrie' of any country that gave him a field for it, and perceiving he could not hope for it in England he determined to return to Vienna.

In announcing this determination to the Comte d'Artois, in a letter of March 1802, he reminded him of his previous offers of service, urged him to look forward to a restoration, and reiterated the assurances of his own devotion. To this the Prince replied in terms of equal confidence, and invited further correspondence. When he reached Vienna, Metternich, Gentz, and Cobentzel were greatly impressed by him, and constantly exchanged their views on the most important public matters; but no overture leading him to hope for official employment was made to him till, chafing under inaction, he turned his eyes towards Russia. His old friend Prince Adam Czartoryski had become the Emperor Alexander's Minister for Foreign Affairs, and to him, in February 1804, he addressed a letter formally proposing to be received into the Russian service, and asking to be allowed to go to St. Petersburg if his request were not summarily rejected. He expressed the strong desire he had always entertained of devoting his energies to public business, and complained of having been condemned for years to bear the terrible burden of doing nothing.

'Separated by irresistible causes from the sphere of his duties and of activity, he had often cast his eyes on the map of the world to find a country and a sovereign he would wish to serve, and none had impressed him so much as Russia, which is the only country that is great without having developed all its natural resources; while the eminent qualities of the sovereign, his love of good, and even his youth, are an encouragement to those who aspire to serve him with constancy and integrity.'

The answer to this appeal was an invitation to proceed at once to St. Petersburg, accompanied by a warning not to allow the motive of his journey to be known and to let it be supposed that he went merely as a traveller to visit a country he had not before seen—a hint on which he acted so successfully that his most intimate friends had no suspicion of the truth, as appears from a delightfully characteristic letter that he received from the well-known Prince de Ligne, which it would be a pity to spoil by translation.

'Les glaces de la Néva ne couvriront jamais le Vésuve de votre cœur et de votre esprit, mon cher ami. La lave un peu suspendue

n'en coulera que mieux dans la petite maison couleur de rose à votre retour. Vous verrez beaucoup de gens presque d'esprit, de beaucoup d'astuce et presque aimables, et ceux qui ne seront pas comme cela bien médiocres. Vous verrez quelques beaux restes de la grande Femme, qui savait bien qu'il faut de la fable et de la magie à un pays comme celui-là, qui sans cela n'est que le squelette d'un géant. Elle savait lui donner de l'embonpoint et se servait du mythologiste Potemkin pour cela. Tous les deux vous auraient aimé à la folie. J'espère qu'on ne vous connaîtra pas assez pour vous aimer ou vous détester. Le premier est dû à vos qualités aimables, et le second aux grandes et essentielles qui humilient la canaille. Or le monde d'à présent n'est que cela. . . . Revenez-nous bien vite; songez à la fable des deux pigeons. Je suis celui qui ne voyage pas. Vous ne serez pas pris dans les filets, mais vous nous reviendrez boiteux pendant trois ou quatre jours d'une chute en traîneau,' &c.

Pozzo arrived at St. Petersburg towards the end of 1804, and immediately communicated to Prince Czartoryski a memorandum containing his views upon the relations of Russia and France, quickly following it with others on the affairs of other countries, which so much impressed the Emperor that within three months he was selected for a mission to Vienna, whence he was afterwards to proceed to Italy as general commissioner to assist General Lacy, who commanded the Neapolitan forces.

En route he stopped at Mittau, in order to be presented to King Louis XVIII., who was living there *incognito* under the title of the Comte de Lille, and by whom he was more favourably impressed than he had expected. He remained more than seven months among his old friends at Vienna, and there, immediately before his departure for Naples, he received from Prince Czartoryski the intimation that the Emperor had made him a 'conseiller d'état actuel;' but he had scarcely reached his destination when the news of the capitulation of Ulm, followed by the battle of Austerlitz, determined him to hurry back to St. Petersburg. He had no sooner arrived there, in May 1806, than he wrote a letter to Czartoryski, giving his views on the state of affairs and the lines of policy it would be necessary for Russia to adopt. 'There were,' he said, 'but two alternatives: either, in concert with England, to endeavour to secure a peace on a solid basis—if Napoleon would consent to it—or else to prepare resolutely for the struggle.' He pointed out the danger to Russia of the relations between France and Turkey which Sebastiani was endeavouring to establish at Constantinople, and in which the fatal weakness of Sir J. Duckworth allowed him to be successful, prophesying that the day would

come (fifty years later) 'when the French artillery and 'infantry would be found fighting with the Turkish cavalry 'against the Russians.'

In the autumn Pozzo, who had received rank in the Russian army, and was again attached as colonel to the person of the Emperor, was again despatched on a mission of importance to Vienna, where he was to ascertain the real intentions of the Austrian Court and endeavour to determine it to unite with Russia and Prussia in a campaign against France; but by the time he reached the Austrian capital Napoleon was already at the gates of Berlin, and there was clearly nothing to be done.

He was then directed to proceed to the East, to assist in negotiating a peace that should put an end to the war between Russia and Turkey, which the influence of the French ambassador at Constantinople had brought about, and he was present at the action off Mount Athos, called the battle of Monte Santo, in which the Russian admiral Seniavin defeated and destroyed a great part of the Turkish fleet commanded by the Capitan Pasha, which, however, only led to an armistice, as the negotiations for a treaty of peace were put an end to by the news of the Treaty of Tilsit, upon which Pozzo at once returned to St. Petersburg.

Pozzo di Borgo's conduct on this occasion was in the highest degree creditable to him. The arrangements of the Treaty of Tilsit were so much opposed to his own views that he felt that he could not, as an honest man, remain in the service of the Emperor to assist in carrying out a policy of which he entirely disapproved; and this he stated to his imperial master with perfect openness. The Emperor declared that there was no occasion for his leaving the service, and that his own friendship with Napoleon did not impose any such sacrifice upon him; but Pozzo insisted that he could not be useful to the sovereign, and would only be a cause of embarrassment; that Napoleon, who had not forgotten his old enmity, would be certain sooner or later to demand his extradition; and though the Czar would be too generous to consent to it difficulties would follow on his refusal.

According to Capefigue, who was an intimate friend of Pozzo, and probably heard it from himself, he concluded his conversation with Alexander with these striking words:—

'The alliance of your Majesty and Napoleon will be of no long duration: I know the falseness and insatiable ambition of Bonaparte,

At this moment your Majesty has one arm held by Persia and the other by Turkey, and Bonaparte is weighing on your breast: free your hands first, and then you will easily throw off the weight on your chest. In a few years we shall see each other again.'

But, whatever credit may be due to Count Pozzo for his readiness to sacrifice his own position and interests rather than be associated in policy that he disapproved, it would be more satisfactory if his conduct on this occasion could be attributed to any high-minded objection to be a party to a nefarious scheme of rapine and plunder instead of to his deep-rooted aversion to and distrust of Napoleon. It is, however, impossible to take this favourable view when we know that, when the Emperor had fallen and the Bourbons were replaced upon the throne of France, he used his utmost endeavours to bring about an alliance between Charles X. and the Emperor Nicholas upon much the same conditions as those agreed upon at Tilsit between Napoleon and Alexander for the aggrandisement of France and Russia.

Pozzo, having received permission from the Emperor to leave St. Petersburg, went at once to Vienna, where he lived about two years as a private individual in the intimacy of his numerous old friends till he was pursued by the rancour of Napoleon, who deprived him of that asylum by demanding his expulsion, which the Austrian Government were afraid to disobey. Prince Metternich, when informing him of this demand, pretended that the Emperor had refused to comply with it, but at the same time he begged him immediately to leave the capital. He at first received the intimation haughtily, claiming his privileges as a Russian subject and officer attached to the person of his sovereign, and said that he must consult his ambassador before he gave an answer; but from the ambassador he obtained little encouragement. Count Schouvalow, who had evidently got instructions, received him awkwardly and with embarrassment, declaring that he could not enter into any official communication on the subject, and ending, like Prince Metternich, by recommending him to leave Vienna as though of his own free will.

He perceived that he was to be sacrificed to his all-powerful enemy, and addressed a somewhat indignant letter to Alexander, couched in firm though respectful language, offering to resign his appointments into his Majesty's hands and asking permission to leave Europe, but energetically declining to accept the 'miserable position' that Metternich had proposed to him. He owed it to himself, he said,

‘not to submit to any proposal unworthy of him; he could not forget that he was born free and a gentleman, and, having sacrificed everything in order to remain such in the estimation of his superiors and of his equals, no consideration of danger or of interest should ever induce him to descend from the rank in their esteem to which he felt himself entitled;’ and he wound up by assuring the Emperor that, whithersoever his destiny might take him, his Majesty might be assured of always finding in him a faithful servant, who had taken too great an interest in the glory of the throne and of the country which had adopted him for it ever to be effaced from his heart. The day would come when all those devoted to the interests of Russia would find occasion to share her dangers, and he hoped under his Majesty’s auspices to co-operate in her triumph. From the closing sentence of this appeal it would almost appear that he still entertained some hope that the generosity of Alexander’s nature would prompt him to stand by a faithful servant whom he had treated as a friend, for it concluded with the words, ‘*Mon sort est entre les mains de votre Majesté Impériale et je l’attends sans inquiétude;*’ and if so, he was doomed to disappointment.

Russia and Austria were both far too much under the domination of Napoleon for either of them to venture to disobey or displease him, and the answer that he received to his letter was an intimation that the Emperor accepted his resignation, but would continue the emoluments he had been receiving in whatever country he determined to establish himself. This gave him no choice, and he left Vienna in the last days of 1810, though we do not gather, either from Capéfigue or from the Vicomte Maggiolo, whether he waited for the official order for his expulsion or finally accepted Metternich’s ‘miserable’ suggestion of going apparently of his own accord. He did not carry out the intention of leaving Europe, which he had announced to the Emperor; he must have been conscious that he would be wretched if far removed from all that was going on, and in 1811 he found an asylum in England, where he had found one in 1797, and he remained in it till the course of events took him back to Russia.

Pozzo must have been more than human if he did not deeply resent his abandonment by his sovereign, but with him resentment was a much less permanent sentiment than his passion for political activity, and, perhaps it should be added, his wish to aid in the destruction of his great country-

man and enemy. His old friend Lord Minto, being then Governor-General of India, was not among those to welcome his return to England, where, however, he was sufficiently well known not to need any introduction. Lord Castlereagh and Lord Wellesley were in the habit of applying to him for the information on the state of affairs on the Continent which he was so well able to give, and towards the end of 1811, when Napoleon was making preparations for the invasion of Russia, they made him the medium for conveying to the Emperor their wish to come to an understanding upon the resistance to be offered.

In a long letter to Alexander Pozzo informed him of this overture, and offered to re-enter his service; but the Czar, in reply, merely thanked him for the communication without inviting him to St. Petersburg, where his presence might, no doubt, be inconvenient if it became necessary for him to make peace with Napoleon; but, when the invading army had penetrated as far as Moscow, Alexander became anxious for his presence, and urged him to lose no time in joining him 'by the quickest and safest route.' The route by way of Sweden, being considered the most secure, was adopted by Pozzo, and this accidental circumstance led to important results, and to his own greatest diplomatic success, by enabling him to gauge the feelings towards Napoleon of Bernadotte, who was governing the country under the title of Prince Royal. When he joined the Emperor at Kalisch he was received with every mark of affection and reinstated in the Russian service, and, proceeding to give an account of his interviews with Bernadotte, expressed his belief that he might be detached from France by suggesting that the annexation of Norway to his Swedish kingdom would be the price of his defection.

Alexander, after listening to all he had to say, was struck by the importance of the object to be gained, and in a few days despatched Pozzo back to Sweden on an official mission with instructions to endeavour to secure it. On his former visit he had been a mere private individual, able to speak only in his own name, but this time he came before the Prince Royal armed with the authority of an accredited agent of the Russian Government. His task, however, was by no means an easy one, as Bernadotte at first insisted on receiving a distinct pledge that Norway should be given to him, while Pozzo was not authorised to go further than to offer a conditional promise, and to encourage the expectation that this would be done; but, in the end, he was entirely

successful and carried his point. His description of Bernadotte, in his letters to Nesselrode, is extremely amusing. The Prince was, he says, utterly unlike any statesman with whom he had ever been called upon to do business—a man of undoubted talent, with manners that showed the revolutionary school in which he had been brought up, breaking out into the rages and the language of a ‘muleteer,’ and of a vanity which made him believe that it was only by his gracious permission that the sun showed itself in the heavens. It was well known that this vanity had made him entertain the expectation of being Napoleon’s successor on the throne of France, and in the strange letter in which he signified his acceptance of the Russian proposal he said that, ‘although he had always been convinced that after the death of Napoleon his empire would pass to the most worthy, and although, by continuing the ally of France, he would have claims like the other lieutenants of that illustrious captain, he nevertheless preferred the alliance of the Czar.’ He perceived which was likely to be the winning side, and to it he determined to attach himself.

On the successful termination of his mission to Sweden Pozzo was sent to England, whence he accompanied Lord Castlereagh to the headquarters of the allies, remaining in attendance on Alexander till, on the first restoration in 1814, he was appointed to represent his sovereign at the Court of the Tuileries, and the volume of his correspondence lately published by his nephew Count Charles Pozzo shows that he was already as completely French in feeling as he continued to be to the end of his career. He had not, however, and could not possibly have, any sympathy with Prince Talleyrand, then prime minister of the King, whose character was in every respect the reverse of his own. He himself possessed in the highest degree the courage, which is so rare among diplomatists, and in which the other was entirely deficient, of expressing his opinions without caring whether they were those of his employers or not, and on reading his correspondence it is impossible not to admire the fearlessness with which he supported them, sometimes braving and incurring the displeasure of the Czar in a way that dismayed the more pliant Nesselrode and Capo d’Istria.

From the moment of his nomination as Alexander’s envoy at Paris he devoted his energies to the consolidation of the close alliance between Russia and France, which he believed to be essential to the interests of both countries; and he was to a considerable degree successful, although not so much so

as he hoped, as he never succeeded in getting the signature of the formal treaty he wished for. The first step towards this alliance was to have been the marriage of the Duc de Berry to the Grand Duchess Anna Paulevna, the sister of the Emperor Alexander, once the destined bride of Napoleon and afterwards Queen of the Netherlands. Whether the project originated or not in Pozzo's fertile brain does not appear, although it seems highly probable, for he certainly took it up with even more than his usual ardour. 'Neglect nothing,' he wrote to Nesselrode in June 1814, 'to bring it about. It is necessary and even indispensable. The peace of the world, perhaps, depends upon it.' Both courts and both countries favoured the match, though the Russian Government was far more bent upon it than the French; but the religious question, of which Pozzo at first made light, proved an obstacle that could not be overcome, owing to the disagreement of the sovereigns as to the period at which the princess should declare her conversion to Catholicism, for the Czar would not consent to its taking place as long as his sister remained in Holy Russia. The correspondence that passed on this subject was very curious, and gave Pozzo the opportunity of displaying amusing ingenuity in suggesting devices by which the difficulty might be removed. At one time the Catholic metropolitan of Mohilew was to inform the King that he had ascertained that the princess had a marked disposition for the Catholic faith, and that her marriage with the Duc de Berry might decide her to proclaim it publicly. Next the Pope was to be appealed to through Cardinal Consalvi, who undertook to induce his Holiness to sanction the marriage, and the King was to allow the Grand Duchess a private Greek chapel, 'en laissant aux miracles de la grâce d'amener avec le temps la conversion volontaire de S. A. Imp.'

But it was all of no avail. Neither the King nor the Emperor would give way, and Nesselrode, in his private letters to Pozzo, confidentially expressed his belief that the stiffness shown by their Imperial master was owing to his doubt of the stability of the French throne. That a Russian princess, after publicly abjuring her religion, should find that she was not to be queen of France was a risk that Alexander was in no hurry to run, and he apparently wished the matter to drag on till he saw the Bourbons more firmly established than he thought them in 1814. Louis, on the other hand, being impatient for the marriage of his heir, wished the Russian alliance to be either con-

cluded or broken off, and with this view, on December 10, he wrote to Prince Talleyrand, who was then attending the Congress of Vienna:—

‘I have given my ultimatum. I will not enquire what may pass in a foreign country, but the Duchesse de Berry, whoever she may be, shall not cross the frontiers of France without openly professing the Catholic, Roman, Apostolic religion. On these terms I am not only ready but anxious to conclude; if, on the contrary, these conditions do not suit the Emperor of Russia, let him say so, and we shall none the less remain good friends, but I will treat for another marriage.’

Talleyrand's letter acknowledging the receipt of this ultimatum is a perfect specimen of the art with which he always strove to maintain himself in favour by saying whatever he knew would be agreeable, and by flattering his master's sense of his own dignity and importance. The King, he said, could not possibly do otherwise than insist, as a *sine qua non*, on the conditions he had laid down in his ultimatum, and, proceeding to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the Russian marriage, he found that the objections predominated. He admitted that at first, when the state of France was insecure, he had thought a family alliance with Russia very desirable. But now things were changed; France had no longer need of foreign help, and the King was not now called upon to make sacrifices for such an alliance. The Grand Duchess in herself was everything that could be wished, but her change of religion for purely political motives must encourage in the people that feeling of religious indifference which is the malady of our days. For the House of Bourbon to ally itself to houses inferior to itself was a necessity not to be avoided, since an equal was not to be found in Europe; but, he declared, when the House of Bourbon honoured another by its alliance he would prefer that it should be with one that acknowledged the honour rather than with one which pretended to an equality. Of the four sisters of the Grand Duchess Anna one was married to an archduke and the three others to little German princes. Shall Russia, which had never been able to place one of her princesses on any throne, now see one called to the throne of France? It would be too great a piece of fortune for her, and it would not be pleasant to see the Duc de Berry placed in close relationship with a crowd of princes of the lowest category.

After alluding to Alexander's ambitious views and revolutionary ideas, Talleyrand entreated the King to contrive

that the rupture of the negotiation should not be complete till the questions that were being discussed by the Congress were disposed of, as it would only add to the indisposition the Emperor was already exhibiting towards France, and he wound up by suggesting that the daughter of the Prince Royal of Naples, whose marriage with the Duc de Berry was arranged in the following year, would be a suitable bride for him.

Count Nesselrode, who reached Vienna to take part in the Congress in the middle of September, announced his arrival to Pozzo in a letter which is a curiosity in its way, from its entire omission of all mention of the great questions about to be discussed, and from the evident importance he attached to the private matter with which it dealt.

‘I must speak to you about some private matters, and although it is always great questions that have attractions for you I believe that this will still more be the case in one affecting a fair lady. Know, therefore, that there is about to arrive at Paris Madame Phillis, actress and singer at the theatre of St. Petersburg, who, after the rest of the company had been sent away, remained in the service of the Court, and is still there. The Emperor has always had *beaucoup de bienveillance* for her, and his Majesty has ordered me particularly to recommend her to you. He wishes that she should be considered as still in his service, and protected from the persecution of the Théâtre Feydeau, where she was formerly engaged. I beg you not to treat this matter lightly: *it is more serious than might be thought.*’

It does not appear how Pozzo acquitted himself of this delicate commission, and we are deprived of the information on more important matters that would have been derived from his correspondence with Nesselrode, as a few days later the latter summoned him to Vienna, declaring that no great question could be settled without him. On arriving there he found France and Russia in violent antagonism; the Emperor was bent on carrying out his projects respecting the grand duchy of Posen, and had secured the support of the King of Prussia by promising that the kingdom of Saxony should be annexed to his dominions, and England and Austria were at first not indisposed to acquiesce in the arrangement. But Talleyrand, espousing the cause of the King of Saxony, offered a determined resistance, conducted with consummate ability, and ultimately succeeded in detaching the latter Powers from their northern allies, and obtained the signature by Castlereagh, Metternich, and himself of the Secret Treaty of January 3, 1815, which bound England, Austria, and France to stand together.

Nesselrode had not received from the ambassador the assistance in carrying out their master's wishes on which he had counted when he summoned him from Paris, for Pozzo disapproved of the Emperor's projects in regard to Poland, and, in his usual outspoken way, not only pointed out his objections, but insisted upon them in such strong language as to offend Alexander; insomuch that he had scarcely seen him at Vienna, and was on the point of sending him back to Paris. He remained, however, at Vienna till Napoleon, after escaping from Elba, was approaching Paris, when he proceeded to Ghent, whither the King had retired, and found there a field for his activity—at once opening a correspondence with Nesselrode at Vienna and with Lord Castlereagh and Prince Lieven in London, in which he sketched, with his usual clearness, the position of affairs and his views upon the course it would be desirable to follow.

Fully recognising the ineptitude and folly of the King in not having chosen to govern, according to the spirit of the Constitution, by means of a responsible ministry, and urging that this should be pressed upon him whenever circumstances should make it possible, he insisted that in Louis's restoration lay the only safety that was to be found for France. The country was, he said, divided into three parties—the army, which was unanimously in favour of the Emperor; the Jacobins and regicides, who, aspiring to power themselves, had need of Napoleon to exclude the Bourbons; and, finally, the Moderates, composing the mass of the nation, who wished for a constitutional monarchy. To support these last the allies must therefore be prepared to combat Bonaparte and the army, assisted by all the aid the existing Jacobin Ministry could give them.

His arrival at Ghent had, he wrote, 'been hailed like the apparition of an angel, though he had no pretensions to be 'one,' and among the persons he met there was the Duke of Wellington, who told him that, just as he was leaving Paris, Fouché, who was at the very moment accepting the Ministry of Police under Napoleon, had made to him the curious piece of confidence that he was at the same time keeping open for himself the resource of treating with the allies. In addition to this Fouché sent a secret confidential agent to the King to tell him that he was ready to 'se défaire de 'Bonaparte' on receiving the promise of being maintained as Minister of Police under a government of which Prince Talleyrand would be the head.

Pozzo's comments on all this show how well he was

acquainted with the wiles of the arch-intriguer, and how clearly he foresaw what occurred three months later. Fouché, he wrote, is exhausting all the resources of his genius to secure a safe game for himself, however events may turn out. He tries to keep open an asylum in England if every hope is lost of continuing Minister of Police in France. He shows the Duke of Orleans the throne in prospect if it is impossible to effect a reconciliation with Louis XVIII., while to the latter he proposes to replace him on his throne. In all this there is nothing real, but what is certain is that he is serving Bonaparte in every way that can be injurious to the allies, and that he is betraying him by views which can be useful to himself alone.

The last lines of this report must be given in Pozzo's own words:—

'Fouché sees the war approaching; as long as Napoleon can maintain himself he will remain a spectator of the strife; if he fails, Fouché will be seen appearing at the barriers of Paris to receive the allies, and to try to take possession of the Government, in order to turn all the events to his own advantage and to that of his friends. Till then nothing will be obtained from Fouché except intrigues and sterile communications which, when the victory is assured, he will represent as real services.'

Pozzo was soon to find his own opinions at variance with those of his Government. Towards the middle of May he received from Count Nesselrode a memorandum for his guidance, containing the views of the Russian Government upon the attitude they wished the allies to adopt at the present conjuncture, and without communicating them he was directed to ascertain whether they agreed with those of the Duke of Wellington. The Russian Government wished the allies to proclaim that they were making war on Bonaparte alone, and that when they had expelled him and made his return impossible they would interfere no further; the King should release the members of the Chamber from their oaths to the constitution granted by his Majesty, and would announce that a new assembly should decide upon one that would give satisfaction to the people of France. Pozzo di Borgo spoke to the Duke of Wellington in the sense of this memorandum, as though he did so of his own initiative, but the Duke declared himself entirely opposed to it. The existing charter contained all that was necessary, with some modifications, to secure every reasonable liberty, and with France in its present state nothing but confusion could result from summoning an assembly, of which the

composition was altogether uncertain, to elaborate a new constitution.

Pozzo reported the Duke's objections to the Russian proposal at great length, and in terms so clearly indicating his own participation in them that it provoked Count Nesselrode into saying that he wished, both for his own sake and for that of the Bourbons, that he was less 'crûment 'Bourbonnique.' The Bourbons were at that moment in the Czar's black book. Upon Napoleon's approach to Paris the King had fled with such precipitancy that the ordinary precaution of carrying away or destroying important public documents had been neglected. Talleyrand wrote from Vienna expressing the earnest hope that at least his own correspondence during the Congress had been placed in safety, as it contained matters that would not be agreeable to some of the allies; but he had the mortification of learning that it had been left behind with the rest, and fell into the hands of Bonaparte, who thus became acquainted with the secret treaty of January 3, which had been directed against the ambitious projects of Russia and Prussia. Napoleon, with malicious pleasure, forwarded a copy of the treaty to Alexander, to show him how he was treated by those who called themselves his allies; but the Czar declared his determination to adhere to the alliance, though his irritation against Louis, whose minister was the author of the treaty, was so great that he entertained serious thoughts of getting the Duke of Orleans called to the throne on the expulsion of Napoleon; and this it was that made him resent Pozzo's Bourbonnique tendencies.

The letter in which Pozzo replied to Nesselrode's reproaches is one that it is impossible to read without a feeling of respect and admiration for the man who wrote it.

'Your letter,' he said, 'has greatly grieved me. I see in it, as usual, the proofs of your friendship, but unfortunately also of your conviction that my way of judging the affairs of France is not approved. I have served and serve the Emperor with all the devotion I owe to him as my master, my sovereign, and my benefactor. In the matters in which the orders I receive are positive I obey; in those in which my judgement is left free I act according to my conscience and my lights. I could certainly divine the intentions and write in the sense of them, whatever might at bottom be my own opinion, and thus secure favour, I will not say at the cost of truth (for I will not blame anyone, or pretend to see clearer than others), but by a course contrary to my own conviction. No; never shall Pozzo have to reproach himself for such a fault: there lies in my heart a feeling that commands me to respect myself, and if I had the misfortune to stifle it I should no

longer be anything in my own eyes. I am accused of judging the Bourbons better than they deserve, but if ever there was a man who supported their cause solely on principle I am that man. The Bourbons are an institution and not a family, and I put all sovereigns in the same category. I am persuaded that Europe has need of them if it is to remain at peace, and that France, if it is to be free, cannot do without them.'

Count Pozzo was the servant of an autocratic Government, little accustomed to view with indulgence any backwardness in complying with its behests, and this letter gives a good example of the fearless independence which formed such a noble feature in his character. No personal consideration could induce him to express an opinion he did not honestly entertain, and he would not keep silence if he thought it would appear like a tacit acquiescence in what he disapproved. He seems, indeed, at all times to have felt an imperative necessity for giving a free vent to his opinions upon all questions that interested him, and he considered it the duty of a conscientious servant not only to execute his orders, but to state his views freely in every matter affecting his master's interests, as he invariably did in the forcible language which he delighted in using, and which often provoked the anger of his employers.

According to Capefigue, Pozzo was present and severely wounded at the battle of Waterloo; but, however good the authority, it is difficult to believe that, if this were so, no mention whatever of it should be found either in *Vicomte Maggiolo's Life* or in his letters to or from Count Nesselrode.

From that time, or very soon after, Pozzo di Borgo must be regarded as much in the light of a confidential adviser of the King of France as in that of the diplomatic representative of the Emperor of Russia, and in the former character his correspondence shows that his advice was uniformly sagacious in all matters relating to internal administration, and that he did his utmost to induce the sovereign to follow a course calculated to reconcile all classes of his subjects, without suffering himself to be guided by the narrow views of the Comte d'Artois and the extreme Royalists. He remained with the King after the battle, and it was at his instance that the proclamation promising pardon and constitutional reforms was issued at Cambrai; and having secured this, to which he attached great importance, he proceeded at once to the Duke of Wellington's headquarters, where he arrived at the moment of the capitulation of Paris, and found the Duke as anxious as himself to spare

the capital from occupation by foreign troops. But Blücher, of whose hardness and 'brutality' he often speaks with indignation, too much bent upon retaliating on the French for their occupation of Berlin to listen to any remonstrances, insisted on quartering his troops in the town where 'leurs pillages et dévastations font horreur.' In his letters he constantly contrasts their behaviour with that of the British under the Duke of Wellington, whose conciliatory attitude does not, however, seem to have been much appreciated by the French, for a year later we find Pozzo, after again alluding to the harshness of the Prussians, writing that the English Government continued to act with much consistent moderation, but that England was to France 'un pôle de répulsion ;' that neither reason nor policy, nor even the force of circumstances, would ever diminish the bitterness and distrust caused by the rivalry of the two countries. He did not believe that there ever was a period when the two nations were more widely separated or when the two Governments were less so.

After Napoleon's abdication at Fontainebleau in 1814 France was allowed to retain the frontiers of 1792, and the territories conquered up to that time were restored to her; but in 1815 some of the Powers, wishing to take advantage of the position to aggrandise themselves, were unwilling to grant even the frontiers of the kingdom as they were before the commencement of the revolutionary war, and brought forward a draft treaty by which, among other extreme conditions, the cession to the allies of Alsace, of a part of Lorraine, and of other important provinces was insisted on. The draft treaty was submitted to Pozzo for his remarks, and he declared in his report that if the King were to consent to it France would be effaced from the map of Europe, which he believed to be the real object aimed at; that Louis could not accept what was required from him without committing an act of political suicide; but, as in his position some sacrifices were unavoidable, there were concessions he might make and still have a hope of safety. He suggested, therefore, among other modifications of the project, that the old frontier of the monarchy should be retained, but that the conquered territories annexed to it by the treaty of 1814 should be given up, and that the occupation of the kingdom by the allied armies should be limited to three years instead of being extended to seven, as was proposed. Alexander was more disposed than his continental allies to act generously towards France, and, influenced by Pozzo's energetic advocacy,

directed him to concert with the King in drawing up such a letter to him as might be communicated to the other Governments setting forth his objection to comply with their demand. The letter suggested by the Emperor appears to have been drafted by Pozzo with extreme art, so as to avoid awakening a suspicion of its having been inspired by the Czar himself, or even betraying a knowledge that he was not in entire agreement with the other allies. The King began, on the contrary, by expressing the grief with which, in his conversations with Alexander, he had heard him advocate the proposals that had been made, though his knowledge of his Majesty's generous nature prevented him from believing it possible that he could be irrevocably in favour of ruinous and dishonourable conditions, and he ended by a formal declaration that he would descend from the throne rather than become an instrument for the destruction of his people.

The stratagem was completely successful: the allies durst not insist upon terms that would lead to the abdication of Louis and to complications of which the issue could not be foreseen. The compromise suggested by Pozzo was adopted as the basis of the treaty, and, though it may well be questioned whether the part played by Alexander was consistent with loyalty to the allies, with whom he was associated, there can at least be no doubt of the service rendered by Pozzo both to France and to his own Government, which acquired by it the predominant influence at the Tuileries that lasted till the fall of Charles X. in 1830.

Prince Talleyrand necessarily became the head of the first administration of Louis when he found himself once more upon his throne; but it was soon evident that it would not be easy for him to maintain himself long, and he endeavoured to strengthen his position by inviting Pozzo to join his administration with any portfolio he might select; but, although the Emperor himself favoured the arrangement, the offer was firmly declined, partly from his dislike of Talleyrand and on account of the precarious nature of a ministerial office, and partly, no doubt, because he felt that, as Russian envoy, he could more effectually serve the cause of France, which he continued to do with a zeal and impetuosity that alarmed his friends Nesselrode and Capo d'Istria, who constantly urged him to show his French sympathies less openly. The former wrote to him: 'I beseech you, my dear Pozzo, to be impartial and not to disguise from yourself the extent of your responsibility.' But to ask Pozzo to be impartial was to require of him an

impossibility. When he had once formed an opinion he was not troubled by doubt or misgiving; he was perfectly indifferent to anything that could be urged in favour of views differing from his own, whether by friends or by opponents, and he must often have been an embarrassing agent for those who had to negotiate with other governments, to whose opinions they were obliged to show some deference. Being convinced that the policy of Prussia was inspired by a vindictive hatred of France, while that of Austria was guided by a wish to weaken the position of the King, and so to keep open a possibility of placing the King of Rome upon the throne, he conceived it to be his duty to oppose those two Powers at every turn.

Alexander had not forgiven Talleyrand for the treaty of January 3, nor for his inclination for a close understanding between France and England, and the natural difficulties with which the minister was surrounded not being lessened by the action of the Russian ambassador, his speedy fall was inevitable, and Pozzo di Borgo exerted all his influence over the King to secure the nomination of the Duc de Richelieu, who had long been in the Russian service, in which he had distinguished himself in the campaign against Turkey, and who might be relied upon for his Russian sympathies. Consequently, when the latter was appointed successor to Prince Talleyrand, Pozzo's activity was redoubled, and the two worked together like members of one administration. In a letter to Nesselrode he wrote:—

‘I am obliged to twist myself about like a dog tormented by a swarm of flies: I, of all men the least of a courtier, have to pay my court to the Duke of Wellington; to urge the King to be firm; to beg his minister not to allow himself to be discouraged; to tell Monsieur that if he does not alter his system he will ruin himself and those belonging to him, the Jacobins that they are scoundrels, and the Ultra-Royalists that they are madmen.’

And this was scarcely an exaggeration. He was not over-modest in his estimate of his own achievements, for we find him assuring his Government that, although they did not seem satisfied with the way in which things had been going on, they would not go on at all if it were not for himself. But the French Government also were so much convinced of the services he had rendered in the negotiations for the treaty of peace that a few months after its signature, in November 1815, King Louis proposed to create him a count and ‘pair de France,’ with an annual dotation of 60,000 francs—an offer so obviously ill-timed, while the troops of the allies were

occupying French territory, and while many arrangements had still to be combined between them, that Alexander refused to permit its acceptance by his ambassador, and only gave his consent three years later, when the evacuation decided upon at Aix-la-Chapelle had been carried out. In the double character in which he must be regarded at this time Pozzo di Borgo was at least as much occupied by the internal affairs of France as by the ordinary duties of an ambassador, and there was a striking inconsistency in his conduct with regard to them. He recognised the necessity for the establishment in France of a liberal constitutional government, and he threw his whole weight on the side of those who were opposing the reactionary efforts of the Ultra-Royalists, who wished to replace the sovereign in the exercise of the unfettered authority possessed before the Revolution. But in all other countries where a spirit of freedom began to manifest itself he was ready to go any lengths in suppressing it, and he attended the congresses of Troppau, Laybach, and Verona when the Holy Alliance carried into practical effect its doctrine of intervention on behalf of arbitrary power by sanctioning the invasion of Naples and Piedmont by Austria and of Spain by France.

When the Greek revolution broke out Pozzo at once perceived that sooner or later it would be followed by a war between Russia and Turkey, which might help the realisation of his long-cherished scheme of alliance between Russia and France, of which the Ottoman Empire would bear the cost, and he found his Government well disposed to support him. In June 1825 Count Nesselrode instructed him to make a confidential but official overture to the French Cabinet, and to intimate that if France would give Russia a loyal and energetic support the Emperor might be counted upon to prove the high value he attached to the service.

It was one of the last instructions Pozzo received from Alexander, who died before the end of the year, and for a time the matter went no further; but when the battle of Navarino was followed by the war between Russia and Turkey, which Pozzo had from the first foreseen, the French Government, remembering the overture made to them three years before, set themselves to consider the price they might demand in return for the assistance they were ready to render to the Czar. After much deliberation they resolved to propose to the Emperor a scheme of alliance, involving not only the partition of Turkey, but the reconstruction of the map of Europe, from which Holland and Saxony, for the

preservation of which France had made such efforts at the Congress of Vienna, were to be erased as independent states. It had not, however, been submitted to the Russian Government when the news unexpectedly reached Paris of peace between Russia and Turkey having been concluded at Adrianople in September 1829, and the favourable moment was considered to be past.

When we remember the position then held at Paris by Pozzo di Borgo, the confidential footing on which he stood with the French Government, the absolute agreement of the Foreign Minister with his own views, of which he continually boasts in his correspondence with Count Nesselrode, there does not remain a doubt of his having been the prompter or real author of the project, and although its immediate accomplishment was interrupted by the peace of Adrianople he was not the man to be deterred from pursuing his object. The equivalent that the French Government bargained for in return for the Turkish provinces which were to go to Russia comprised Belgium with North Brabant to the Rhine, Luxemburg, and Landau. The support of Prussia was to be purchased by the promise of the kingdoms of Saxony and of Holland as far as the Rhine, leaving to France the part between the Rhine and the Meuse; the assent of Austria was to be got by giving her Serbia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina; and it was hoped that England might be 'squared' by the offer of the Dutch colonies.

It is difficult to understand how it can have been supposed that such a gigantic scheme of spoliation, requiring the assent of all the great Powers, could be carried out except after a general war, but there has long been evidence, believed to be trustworthy, that in 1829 it was being matured by the French Government, and now we have the indisputable evidence of M. Pallain to prove that during the year that followed the peace of Adrianople till the fall of Charles X. in 1830, negotiations on the subject had been going on between France and Russia, and had made much progress, all to the advantage of the latter Power.

In 1829 the advance of Russia into Turkey as far as Constantinople does not appear to have been a part of the plan of the French Government. The Emperor was professing the warmest possible sympathy for the kingdom of Greece, then in the process of creation, but the fixed determination he afterwards expressed of never tolerating a large extension of it was not known, and it is believed that, according to the first French project, in addition to Crete

and the Archipelago, Greece was to have Constantinople and a great part of Turkey in Europe, with a population of eight millions. It is evident that this could not suit the views of the Emperor Nicholas, and consequently when the negotiations were resumed in 1830 the French Government found that if they were to obtain the Rhine frontier by Russian assistance they must bid a higher price for it than they had at first intended. We learn from M. Pallain that they did not hesitate to do so, and that Europe was only saved from the convulsions which must have followed an attempt to realise the project by the revolution which precipitated Charles X. from the throne. M. Pallain's statements may be accepted without reserve or hesitation, for he has been 'chef de cabinet' at the French Foreign Office, and, writing after having free access to its archives, he points out in his preface to the '*Correspondance inédite du Prince Talleyrand*' that Pozzo di Borgo had never abandoned the policy of an alliance between France and Russia, which had been begun at Tilsit, and that during the whole of the Restoration his principal aim had been to carry it out. He adds:—

•
'It is now known that at the moment when, by the folly of the Polignac ministers, the revolution of 1830 broke out, the plan of M. Pozzo was on the point of success. France had the promise of the Rhine frontier, while Russia *avait licence de pousser jusqu'à Constantinople*; and the expedition to Algiers, carried out in spite of the ill humour of England, is an indication that, in this system of *alliance and partition*, France was to be admitted to a share of the Ottoman Empire.'

Nothing can be more striking to an English reader than the open exhibition of regret at the failure of this conspiracy shown by M. Pallain and the Vicomte Maggiolo, who appear perfectly unconscious of its enormity, and who speak with complacent admiration of a project based upon the unprovoked partition of one great empire and the annihilation of the independence of two or three minor states for no object but that of the territorial aggrandisement of France and Russia.

When we think of the storm of indignation that would be raised in this country if the Government were suspected of entering into an engagement so offensive to every feeling of public morality, we may perhaps hesitate before believing that our neighbours would see the matter differently; but when it is remembered that the project in question was deliberately adopted at a time of profound peace by the

ministers, not of an ambitious conqueror like Napoleon, but of a legitimate king of the old French race, and that its failure is to this day regretted by such men as M. Pallain and the Vicomte Maggiolo, it may well be asked whether there is any ground for feeling confident that their countrymen in general would be found more scrupulous in renewing it if they thought the opportunity favourable.

Count Pozzo's letters after the revolution of 1830 show how deeply he grieved over it, but, strangely enough, the event which thwarted him in a policy that would have plunged Europe into war gave him the opportunity of rendering the most important service of his whole career to the cause of peace. When the news of the revolution reached St. Petersburg the wrath of the Emperor knew no bounds, and he was eager to adopt immediate measures of coercion against the new king of the French, and it was chiefly through Pozzo that he was prevented from taking steps from which he could not easily draw back.

The unconquerable aversion always exhibited by Nicholas towards Louis Philippe was, in the opinion of M. Pallain, as stated in the preface already quoted, more to be attributed to his anger at finding his cherished designs against Turkey shattered by the revolution than to any devotion to the cause of legitimacy, which, at the time of the Restoration, Russia had been ready to abandon in favour of the same Duke of Orleans who was now placed on the French throne. England at once recognised the new king; Austria and Prussia quickly declared their intention of doing the same, and Count Pozzo from the first had strongly urged upon his Government that it was only by a prompt recognition that the tranquillity of France could be preserved and the danger of a republic averted; but on the very day on which Lord Stuart presented his credentials as British ambassador Pozzo received from St. Petersburg an instruction, couched in terms of angry and unreasoning violence, which put him in a position of great embarrassment. He was ordered to leave the embassy house as one belonging to a Government the Emperor did not recognise, to see that every Russian subject in France at once left the country, to give no passport for Russia to any Frenchman, and to announce that the tricolour flag would not be admitted to Russian ports; and at the same time a communication was addressed to London, Vienna, and Berlin proposing concerted action.

Nicholas was not a master whose orders could be safely trifled with; but Pozzo saw the disastrous consequences likely

to result from their execution, and he wrote to Count Nesselrode stating the embarrassment in which he found himself. His first impulse, he said, was blindly to obey his instructions, but his reason told him to wait: if the Powers were to act in concert, as the Emperor wished, it would be necessary to recognise, as the others were already doing so, and if an *éclat* were now made Russia could not recognise without a manifest contradiction. He had therefore decided to temporise till the Emperor had the whole circumstances before him, and then things should be done as his Majesty might direct.

The delay allowed the first burst of the Czar's anger to cool, or the more prudent counsels of Nesselrode, who was absent from St. Petersburg when the instruction was issued, to prevail; the order was not repeated, though it was not till four months after the revolution that Pozzo presented his credentials to Louis Philippe. But he had not waited for this to enter into unofficial communication both with the ministers and with the King himself, at audiences held with the utmost secrecy either in the apartment of the Princess Adelaide or in that of Madame de Montjoye, one of the Queen's ladies of honour, to whom the arrangement of them was entrusted.

Even after Louis Philippe had been grudgingly recognised by Russia the position of Count Pozzo was one of extreme difficulty, and required the exercise of all his tact; at one time he had to labour to prevent the French intervention in Belgium from leading to a rupture, and at another to allay the anger of Nicholas at the sympathy shown in France for the Polish insurgents. He had remained as much devoted to the interests of France as he had been during the reign of the Bourbons; but the Czar did not share the sympathies of his ambassador, whose enemies were continually representing him as too completely French to be a true Russian, and in January 1835, suddenly and without warning, he found himself transferred to the embassy in London, which he and his friends looked upon in the light of a disgrace that was keenly felt.

He arrived at his new post at a moment little calculated to reconcile him to the change; the secret article of the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, by which the straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were opened to the fleets of Russia and closed against those of all other nations, extorted from the Sultan as a blow against the influence of Great Britain and as a means of establishing Russian predominance at Con-

stantinople, had recently become known, and the relations of the two countries were the very reverse of cordial. He had the satisfaction of finding his friends Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington in office, the former as Prime Minister and the latter as Foreign Secretary; but he did not enjoy it long, and when, within three months, they were succeeded by Lord Melbourne and Lord Palmerston, for whom he had a profound antipathy, his residence in London became altogether distasteful. He felt that he could not be happy unless he got back to Paris, where he had spent so many years of his life and where all his interests were centred, and in 1839 he resigned his embassy on the plea of ill health. He was seventy-five years of age, and had well earned a right to rest: but rest was of all things that which he wished for least; active work was as necessary to him as the air he breathed. He used to say that he would rather die of fatigue than of *ennui*, and if he had been allowed to retain his post at Paris his death in 1842 would certainly have found him still in harness.

In private life Count Pozzo was adored by those immediately belonging to him, and was a universal favourite among all who knew him, a delightful companion to both old and young, a great and admirable talker with vast and varied knowledge, a steady friend, always ready to oblige and to do a good turn when it was within his power; but he has been accused of having been vindictive in his antipathies, and of having pursued Napoleon with a hatred that was not even buried in his grave. It has been affirmed in some notices of his life that, on hearing of the Emperor's death, he exclaimed with 'vindictive exultation' that if he had not killed Napoleon he had at least thrown the last shovelful of earth upon his coffin; but such stories as this may be dismissed as idle and malicious fables.

In early life he had hailed with enthusiasm the movement in France which, in common with so many men of moderate opinions, he believed would lead to the establishment of constitutional monarchy, of which he continued to the end the consistent advocate, and he could no more tolerate the tyranny of the Consulate and Empire than that of the early Republic, but there is no reason for attributing to hatred of the man the animosity that was directed against the ruler and the conqueror.

Heartless exultation over the death of an adversary who had long ceased to be dangerous could only proceed from a want of the generosity of feeling that was a distinguishing

feature in Count Pozzo's character, and of which the Bonaparte family were so well aware that on various occasions many of them confidently, and never in vain, applied to him for his good offices in matters affecting their interests, and afterwards warmly thanked him for the services he had rendered. Among these were the Princess Eliza Bacchiochi and Caroline the widow of Murat, two of Napoleon's sisters, as well as his brothers Jerome and even Lucien, Prince of Canino, at whose instigation the National Convention had cited him to its bar by a decree that was to send him to the scaffold, and his exertions in their favour in all these cases showed how little the recollection of past injuries rankled in his mind.

The truth is that there was nothing *small* in Count Pozzo's composition; he was impatient of opposition and impetuous in the highest degree, and utterly unlike the ordinary run of statesmen, who pursue the course they believe to be called for by the interests of their country with a devotion perhaps equal to his, but with perfect calmness of temper. Pozzo di Borgo could not be calm or temperate. Every cause he took up he made his own, as if his very existence depended upon it, throwing himself into it with a passion exhibited by most men only when personally affected, and thus he was often supposed to be acting under private animosity when no such feeling existed in him. His admiration for the greatness of Napoleon was intense; he was proud of his country for having produced him, and he would never listen with patience to any attempt to underrate him; but believing that the very greatness of the man, coupled with his inordinate ambition, made it impossible that, as long as he continued to reign, Europe could hope for peace or France could enjoy reasonable freedom at home, he directed the whole of his energies to his overthrow.

The correspondence now published comes down only to the earlier period of his embassy to France, but, if it is continued, the volumes which succeed cannot fail to contain much of the greatest interest, for his influence over the policy of France, which was much greater than is generally known, was at its height in the years immediately preceding the revolution of 1830.

ART. II.—*The Badminton Library: Riding and Polo.* By Captain ROBERT WEIR and J. MORAY BROWN, with contributions by the Duke of BEAUFORT &c. London: 1891.

THE Badminton Library, originally projected by Mr. Longman, and admirably conducted by the zealous personal assistance of the Duke of Beaufort, who has not merely given his name but the authorship of two volumes to the series, has now reached its thirteenth part, and may be said to form a complete encyclopædia of the sports and athletic amusements of the nation. It differs from all similar publications, inasmuch as it is the work of men distinguished not only by their rank, but by their acknowledged personal supremacy in each branch of sport; and the literary ability with which they have given the result of their practical experience to the world certainly entitles them to an honourable mention in these pages. The illustrations in each volume are copious and instructive, for, by the aid of instantaneous photography, they suggest to the reader a lively representation of every incident and attitude which occurs in the game. No people, since the days of the ancient Greeks, has been so devoted to athletic sports as the English; no country but our own could produce so varied and interesting a picture of national sports; and it is scarcely necessary to add that they never were pursued with more ardour than at the present time, when they trench in some measure on the work of education and rule the distribution of the social year. It is an age of luxury, but not of effeminacy, and we owe to these manly sports not a little of that energy and power which enables our countrymen to play so considerable a part in the affairs of the globe. We therefore select the last of the Badminton volumes which has been published, that on '*Riding and Polo*,' for a few remarks which will not be unwelcome to many of our readers.

The art of riding is separate from the history and training of the horse. It is true that no one but a good rider can train a young horse thoroughly, and that qualities and knowledge which characterise an accomplished rider are essential to the satisfactory upbringing of the young horse. But, speaking generally, the rider and the actual horse-breaker, as he may be termed for our present purpose, must be regarded as two separate persons. Ninety-nine per cent. of those who ride never do, and never wish to, undertake the schooling of a young horse. As Xenophon, with practical

sagacity, observes: 'It is much better for a young man to exercise himself in riding than to be a breaker of colts.' Fifty per cent. of those who ride are content to do so for amusement, health, or business purposes, simply on the road. In fact, riders may roughly be divided into three classes—trainers of young horses, riders across country with hounds or race-riders, and the great general bulk, who may be termed, for shortness, road riders. The accomplishments and the qualities of these separate classes vary. Just as in angling the dry-fly fisherman is essentially an artist in his craft, while the fisherman who spends an afternoon catching perch in a pond is a fisherman and nothing more, so the race-rider—to take one of our second class—is altogether on a different plane from the doctor who rides his rounds. On the other hand, to carry the comparison somewhat further, the ordinary rider should be much more an expert in his occupation than the ordinary fisherman. It is probable that large numbers of persons who place themselves on the back of a horse altogether fail to appreciate the great opportunities for the exercise of skill which the most commonplace kinds of riding afford. The same failing is visible among riders across country, more especially since hunting has become fashionable as an amusement of the winter. Every season men buy a stud of horses, and proceed to follow hounds, who have next to no idea of managing a horse, we will not say with skill, but with ordinary proficiency. To go a step further, many bold riders across country seem to be quite devoid of the gift of horsemanship, and succeed in occupying prominent places in a run by virtue of stout hearts, good eyesight, and well-selected horses, rather than by reason of any skill as horsemen. Few indeed of the great band of cross-country riders possess this union of qualities—those of the courageous follower of hounds and those of the accomplished horseman. In the work the title of which stands at the head of this article the Earl of Suffolk, in the chapter on 'Riding to Hounds,' has given a bright and unexaggerated sketch of such a rider, whom he well calls 'the pilot;' for on every hand it is exactly this kind of man whom the rest of the hunt follow at a greater or less distance. Such was the late Lord Wilton, of whom Lord Suffolk tells a story characteristic of the apparently easy way in which this kind of rider follows hounds, and of that fine rider himself:—

“Oh, dear! oh, dear! where do they find these dreadful places?”

I never came across them," said Lord Wilton (the father of the present peer), with his usual deprecatory moan, on hearing, during a dinner at Egerton Lodge, some of his guests narrating their deeds of valour. No one had a better right to express such surprise, for, as far as the spectator could judge, Lord Wilton never went out of a canter, and never jumped a big place, though, however fast and far hounds ran, he was always with them.' (P. 16.)

Of the manner in which the 'pilot' manages his horse and keeps with hounds we have, as we have said, a true and graphic sketch. We can reproduce but a small portion of it here:—

'His horse never makes the semblance of a blunder, taking off always at the right place, spreading himself as he does so, yet withal landing with hind legs well under him, ready in a moment for a second effort should false ground or trap lurk concealed by the blackthorn. Can this be the animal that, ere he came into his present owner's hands, had the character of a bold but somewhat rash horse, and a trifle inclined to chance it both as to distance and height of jumping? Endued with some marvellous instinct, our customer seems rarely, if ever, to come down to a big place; as he lands in each field the exact spot where he is to leave it reveals itself by magic; the narrowest part of the ditch, the weakest binders, the lowest rails, lie right in his line, though falls are beginning to be numerous, and steeds who take some getting down may be seen galloping riderless or with besmirched headstalls.'

This is the ideal which the young horseman should set before himself. It is only in England that riding across country is practised generally, and to do so perfectly may well be the highest aim of the rider. The skilful management of the horse, so to say, in the ring, has never been an object of the English horseman; the *manège* has been always regarded by him as something below his attention. That this idea has caused English horsemanship to be deficient in grace is not in the least surprising, and it is certain that no amount of teaching will ever get rid of this natural characteristic. The fact is, that elegant horsemanship is altogether a different thing from that strong riding which is necessary for cross-country sport. In the latter amusement there is a spice of danger, and there is a kind of practical object in the riding, which has a tendency to cause mere grace to be regarded almost as effeminate. The French or German rider who wants an object must seek it either in graceful horsemanship or in very skilful management of the horse, as one may say, in the ring. That which is the object of the more skilful rider, to some extent becomes also the object of the crowd, and as years roll on

the general feeling affects, and must continue to affect, the national horsemanship. The way in which the main object for which the most energetic horsemen use their steeds stamps the character of the riding of a country is well exemplified by the style in which the colonial horseman rides:—

‘It is too common for those who break horses to be rather desirous of showing their undoubted skill in backing and sitting a restive horse than in turning out a well-broken, quiet animal. Many a buck-jumper would never have learnt the habit had he been carefully trained to carry a saddle before he was mounted.

‘Often the horse is taken up one day and mounted the next, thus producing an inveterate buck-jumper, whose evil propensities will return after each time he is turned out to grass.

‘Colonists ride very short, and either leave a horse with a loose head or ride with their hands close up to the bit on either side, an attitude which is certainly not graceful, but in which they seem able to maintain an exceptionally firm seat. This firmness of seat is the great aim which they have in view; if a horse falls, instead of falling clear of him, without, if possible, letting go of the reins, a colonial rider endeavours to part company only at the last possible moment. The knee pads of the colonial saddle are an assistance in attaining this object, besides affording support when descending a steep hill. But many experienced riders are discarding the knee pads in favour of saddles made after the English pattern.’ (P. 205.)

In this rough-and-ready colonial horsemanship on the one hand and the ingenious equitation of a French riding-master on the other, we have, as it were, the two poles of civilised horsemanship. English horsemanship lies between them: it shows, to some extent, a pleasure in the mere management of the horse, such as is the basis of French riding, but it is more largely influenced by the object of the best riders to gallop across country at the tail of a pack of hounds. In barbarous times, or in barbarous countries, grace of horsemanship is absolutely disregarded; the main object of the rider is solely the use of the horse in as effective a manner as possible. A Gaucho or a Tartar cares nothing how he rides or what he does with his horse, so long as he can stick on his back and make long journeys with the least amount of fatigue. But English horsemanship, though it unites to some extent a practical object with a limited amount of art, falls far behind that of ancient Greece. The civilisation of the English horseman is visible most in the extreme care which he bestows on the wellbeing and beauty of his horse. This care falls under another head; it is mentioned here because it is a notable characteristic of the horseman-

ship of the age. For the highest union of pure grace and skill in horsemanship we must go back, as we have just said, many centuries. The best art and the best horsemanship were found together in ancient Greece.

'The Greeks,' writes Mr. Anderson, 'were in the habit of taking all sorts of leaps, across ditches, over walls, upon and from banks. That the rider should be able to pass over all kinds of ground, wild beasts were hunted by horsemen; and to give firm seats and to teach the ready control of the horse, warlike games were played. We have only to read of the various movements suggested for the cavalry, and for single riders, to see how highly trained were the horses, how skilful were the riders, in the days of Xenophon. The circles in the gallop, the rapid courses, and the sudden halts and sharp turns, the collected state necessary for the demi-pesade, all give evidence of a high state of the equestrian art. The Greeks were ideal horsemen. Light, active, hardy, and courageous, they were eminently fitted for the exercise, in which they excelled. A touch upon the neck of the horse, an easy spring from the ground, and the rider was in the saddle, with a hand skilled to guide and a will to control the headlong course. Here was no shortening of stirrup leathers, no fumbling with straps and buckles, no struggle to reach a stiff and awkward seat that required the brace of rigid hands. In a time two thousand three hundred years before this, our day of perfect things, we find the horse trained to the state of the best modern examples; a bit, mild to the horse, amenable to its guidance, which can govern the headstrong steed by its severity; the spur, and a knowledge of its best uses. We find a strong and secure seat without the intervention of stirrups, and a grace of bearing that makes us question the advantages of any such aids to the horseman.' (P. 220.)

This quotation gives an excellent summary of the character of Greek horsemanship as we ascertain it to be, partly from delineation on sculpture, and partly from the literature of the age. A sounder, conciser, and more practical work was never written than Xenophon's *Ἰππικὴ*; throughout the entire treatise there is seen that union of experience with theory which is the basis of every satisfactory work on such a subject as horsemanship. Thus, writing of the spur, he urges its use before a leap is taken; 'for if,' he says, 'the horse does all 'these things'—that is, takes these leaps—'with an impetus 'of his whole body, he will do them with more safety to himself and his rider than if his hinder parts lag either in 'leaping over an object or in springing up and down.' What is it that is looked for in a good and trustworthy hunter? It is chiefly, so far as jumping is concerned, that he should be a bold, clean jumper, one who, to use an expression of the hunting-field, 'does not leave his legs behind 'him.' What is it, again, that causes half the accidents

which occur in the hunting-field? It is the half-hearted jumps, the dropping of hind legs into the ditch on the landing side, the want of *vis* in the leap. Thus, we see in this advice of Xenophon the very opinions which a good cross-country rider would now express to one seeking his advice as a learner. This is but one instance of the practical side of Greek horsemanship—in the same book there are further examples of it, and of the grace of horsemanship; but for the latter it is, perhaps, best to go to the descriptions which have come down to us in classic sculpture.

The horsemanship of the Greeks united the two essentials of grace and effectiveness. It was not merely the art of the *manège*, it was also that of the hunting-field; the skilled horseman was likewise the most efficient cavalry soldier, so that he united capacities which, except to some extent among the Romans, have always been separate. The Australian farmer and the Cossack scout are proficient horsemen, capable of great feats of endurance and hardihood, and they have immense power over the animal which they use. But they have never elevated riding to a fine art. The Greeks, at their national games, regarded the skilful rider as a hero, and the worship of beauty of form and movement which characterised the age impressed itself likewise on the horsemanship of the nation. To a certain extent the same points are noticeable among the Romans; but it is clear that they were less skilful 'all round' horsemen, to use a colloquial expression, than the Greeks. When we reach the Middle Ages, the horsemanship of Europe appears on a single level: the character of the arms and of the warfare of the age necessarily tended to make horsemanship less graceful and less brilliant, while the tournament and the tilting ring caused the *manège* to be regarded as the highest kind of riding. There was then, no doubt, much skilful riding, but it differed essentially from that which preceded and has followed it. It was the riding of the modern military tournament; horsemanship was, as it always has been, and always will be, influenced by the object for which it was chiefly used. In England, sport is a higher object than arms. But in France and Germany the military spirit tends to impress on the horsemanship of the nation a military character, exactly the reverse of what is visible in this country.

There never was any sort of riding less formal or less done with a view to appearance than riding at the game of

polo. Nerve, activity, and vigour characterise this game. Its introduction as an English amusement illustrates the riding of the people. It is true it has not yet become a general game, but it is now, in summer, an accepted amusement among many riders. It has been played for centuries in the East. Chaugan, as it is called, was, for example, one of the favourite pastimes of the Emperor Akbar, the chief ground being at a place called Gharivali, about four miles from Agra. The ill-fated town of Manipore was also, in quite recent times, a place where it was played with skill and vigour. About 1854-5 it was played in Cachar, partly by natives and partly by the European tea-planters. In 1859 a small European club was established in the same place. In 1861 or 1862 polo was introduced into the Punjab and North-West Provinces, and thus it gradually worked its way all over British India. In England the first match was played in June 1870, in Richmond Park, between the Blues and the 1st Life Guards; in 1872 the Monmouthshire Polo Club was established. The game has since gradually been increasing in popularity; greater skill has been shown in it, and it has apparently taken its place as a permanent summer game for many young, active, and well-to-do men. Its naturalisation in this country is a remarkable example of the popularity of physical exercise among the English people, and is characteristic of the love of vigorous horsemanship with, so to say, an object in view. Polo falls behind hunting and steeplechasing as regards skill and nerve in the rider, and it does not require the same knowledge of the capacity and the nature of the horse; it is therefore inferior to them in all respects. But it has had an important effect on the horses of the country. It has produced a demand for small, sound, and active horses: 'a bamboo stick' and 'a pony quick' are the two instruments required by the player. The increase of this particular kind of horse—technically known as 'galloways' at the present day, though they differ essentially from the old-fashioned galloway, which was really a cobby hunter—has in its time caused the rise of a new kind of race meeting, at which pony and galloway races take place under a special set of rules. This latter and particular developement is not a matter of satisfaction: it has introduced another medium for gambling; it has established small race meetings in many places where they did not formerly exist. It is of little use to regret this. Whenever the Englishman can obtain some kind of sport, it is certain that he will do so, whether it produces gambling or not. On

the other hand, the increase of well-bred small horses or 'ponies' has, no doubt, helped to improve a very useful and general class of animals, useful to the community at large, which is a matter for congratulation.

Having made this rapid glance at the main characteristics of the horsemanship of the past and present, there is no reason to be dissatisfied with ourselves.

'Except in the higher training of horses'—we again quote from the Badminton book on Riding (p. 230)—'the English are far and away the best horsemen in the world. It is because I believed this, and because I felt the importance of better methods of training than those now employed in this country, that I have so often ventured to address English horsemen upon the subject of thorough schooling. In breeding horses, in rearing, and in caring for them, in racing them and in riding them across country, the Englishman is easily first. No man can drive like an Englishman, and there is no man who understands and appreciates the animal better. But there is one form of the art in which he fails: that is, in so suppling and uniting the horse that the animal is under immediate and certain control. He looks upon the spur simply as an instrument for inciting the horse to greater speed, and loses more than half of the control that one should have over the animal by neglecting that discipline of the rider's legs which is not only a power in itself, but is of the greatest assistance to the hand. I have seen a Continental trainer, whose seat and awkward movements would bring him into ridicule in the Row, do more with a young horse in an hour than the best horseman I have seen in England could do in a week.'

Of this we are sure—that no rules, however clear, will change the character of English riding so long as the object of it remains the same as at present. Of teachers there has never been a lack; in each generation a new book on the art of riding is published, the authors of some of which would have done well to imitate the brevity of Xenophon. In almost every one of them are sound rules for the young rider; some are dull books, and some, like Sir Francis Head's 'The Horse and his Rider,' are excellent reading. The last of a series which, so far as regards the present century, begins with Astley's 'System of Equestrian Education,' is the Badminton book on Riding, the educational parts of which are from the pen of Captain Robert Weir. The advice given is sound and not diffusely imparted, but it is not new. None the less, it would add much to the pleasure of many riders if they would remember that by nine-tenths of those who back a horse there is much to be learned, and that they may become much better horsemen by endeavouring to carry out in practice rules which they have read in the smoking-room. The

cricketer and the oarsman are carefully taught; the horseman learns his business as he goes along. The oarsman is constantly reminded of his 'form,' but the horseman begins by riding about on a pony in his boyhood; he is promoted to a horse as he grows older, but in nearly every instance he becomes a rider with nothing but a little casual, and not very clear, tuition, probably from some confidential coachman who is not in any sense himself a horseman. Englishmen might become better riders if horsemanship were more taught, though they will, it is certain, never as a race be graceful riders or very skilful in the *manège*.

But if we fail somewhat in this single particular of the mere ornamental management of the horse, we can console ourselves with the knowledge that Englishmen have undoubtedly brought the horse itself to a higher pitch of excellence than the world has ever seen, and its care to something of a fine art. It is sometimes said that we carry the grooming and housing of the horse to a ridiculous extent. Every general system is sometimes, and in some particulars, exaggerated. But the tendency of the English system is only to cause the horse to be now and again too well cared for, which is a fault on the right side. It has also—which is even more important—caused this animal to receive more humane treatment in Great Britain than in any other country. This is a thing which cannot be overvalued. The brutal treatment of one kind of animal has a tendency to cause the same treatment not only to others, but to human beings, and the care which the horse receives, even if it be part of a general solicitude for all animals, is essentially a civilising influence. The perfection to which, as we have said, the horse has been brought in this country, is a matter of common knowledge. The way in which the same thing is occurring in the colonies of Australia and New Zealand is characteristic of the English race.

The horse was not indigenous in Australia, and the first horses which were introduced into that colony were shipped at the Cape, and landed with the first consignment of convicts in 1788. In the beginning of the century there are traces of some thoroughbred stock being imported; the earliest record of a thoroughbred mare being introduced into Australia is that of a mare called Manto, in 1825. In 1820 an Arab horse from Persia was brought into Sydney; in 1823, Sir Thomas Brisbane introduced an Arab stallion from Bombay.

The horse of Australasia is, therefore, probably by breed

a mixture of the English thoroughbred, the English half-bred, and the Arab. The Arab stallion imported by Sir Thomas Brisbane was used by the New South Wales Government for the purpose of breeding horses for the colonial police force. His stock was much prized, and he must certainly have affected the general mixed breed of colonial horses. The increase of thoroughbred stock in the mother country naturally affected the horses of the Antipodes, and in 1859 a regular stud book was published in New South Wales; but New Zealand had no such record till 1862. Up to the present time the latter colony has imported at least forty-six thoroughbred sires from England. Of these there is distinct information; if others have come into the colony, they cannot now be traced. It is doubted by some, however, whether by the introduction of the best English blood the horses of the Colonies have been greatly improved. The probability seems to be that there are more good horses, and also more bad horses, than there used to be. The introduction of horse-racing has naturally caused the best stock to be used for that purpose, whilst for general purposes the worst animals are good enough. 'The common horse of the country,' writes Lord Onslow, 'is fast degenerating into a weedy little animal, which may be called the hobbledohoy of the equine species, something between a horse and a pony.'

Weediness is the characteristic of the refuse of the race-horse breeder's paddock; but these horses often have greater endurance, strength, and courage than their appearance would at first lead an observer to suppose. The same writer seems to attribute this weediness to the increase of sheep breeding:—

'When these colonies were first settled, and the native grasses were rich and abundant, they contained plenty of excellent sustenance for foals; the young horses rapidly increased in bone, substance, and stature on the nourishing provender of the virgin lands. But within a short time the superior commercial attractions of wool, shortly enhanced by remunerative prices for the frozen sheep, induced most horse breeders to run sheep with their horses. The natural consequence followed: the close-biting Merinoes and Lincolns devoured all the most succulent and nourishing of the grasses, and the foals that came over the ground after them were compelled to be content with the leavings. As a result, instead of growing rapidly, the foals made little progress, and were stunted and weedy.' (P. 186.)

Whether, however, the horse, generally speaking, has really degenerated, seems to be doubtful. A number of sound

and servicable animals are constantly coming into use; many horses are exported to India; a class of hunters quite unknown in the colonies ten years ago has sprung up (incidentally we may observe that there are now eleven packs of hounds in New Zealand); and there are a quantity of thoroughbred racehorses.* Thus we should be inclined to believe that not only has the number of horses increased, but also that their general quality has improved. There are, speaking roughly, a million and a half of horses in Australia to two millions in the United Kingdom; and, in a land containing such vast tracts of comparatively uninhabited land, in districts where the luxury of the mother country has not yet penetrated, it is certain that the horses must be rougher and, in a sense, poorer. But the Australasian colonist can now buy, if he wishes them, good horses of every class. This is a result which the colonists may well regard with satisfaction. One thing, at any rate, is clear—that the true breeding places of the Australasian horse are New Zealand and Tasmania. The temperate and equable climate of these colonies makes them essentially suitable for horse breeding. The dry seasons with which Australia is often cursed injuriously affect the young stock, and produce bad grass and undersized animals. In the future, therefore, we look to see the breeding of horses carried to a great extent in New Zealand, and that colony will, so far as horse breeding is concerned, be the Ireland of the Antipodes.

We have spoken above of the care which the Englishman bestows upon his horse. It is, as we have said, sometimes exaggerated; but, speaking generally, care bestowed on animals not only contributes to their wellbeing, but improves the breed. A foal which is insufficiently housed in its early days, which is exposed to cold winds, or is left without plenty of good food, never becomes a really good animal. A mare which has been well cared for during foalhood and her working years will, *prima facie*, throw better stock than one which has been badly treated during the early or the maturer years of her life. It is the inappreciation of these facts among English farmers—who, generally speaking, are the horse breeders of the country—which is one cause of many poor animals being in the market. It arises from one marked fault, which characterises the great bulk of the agriculturists of this country—a want of capital,

* It is apposite to remark that an Australian-bred mare won the Queen's Vase at the Ascot meeting in June last.

and a consequent wish, or perhaps it may be called necessity, not to spend more money than can be avoided. The thing must be taken as we find it; but in a general review of the horse and of his rider at the present time the point cannot be too strongly insisted on, more especially as the want of care of inares and foals by farmers is in marked contrast to that striking solicitude which is noticeable among British horse owners for the horse in the stable.

To write of this part of the subject at length would require many pages of space, but there cannot be a doubt that the housing and grooming of the horse are carried to a remarkable perfection in this country. We are so accustomed to see horses, as the phrase is, 'well turned out,' that we regard the elaborate care for the horse as part of our social economy. It is, of course, carried to the greatest extent in the case of racehorses and hunters, and there cannot be a doubt that it has helped very considerably to bring the English horse to his present perfection. The first, indeed, of four cardinal rules for the horse owner's guidance may be formulated as being that, the more grooming a horse gets, the better he will be in health and looks; the second is, that he should have plenty of food; the third, that he should have regular exercise and plenty of it; and the fourth, that the stable should always be temperate and well ventilated. Stables, no doubt, are often allowed to get close and unwholesome, but the horse flourishes in equable warmth. If these four principal rules are worked out into details, they will be found to cover most of the ordinary details of horse management. Having thus briefly dogmatised in respect of the horse in the stable, is it possible to do the same in respect of the rider in the saddle?

There are two main principles to bear in mind, which appear to include all subsidiary rules. In the first place, a rider should, to use a colloquial but expressive phrase, 'ride with his head as well as with his hands.' In other words, there should be reason in his riding. If, for example, he continually remembers that the reins are intended solely to guide a horse, and that, naturally, the more a rider drags at a horse's mouth, the more he will pull, half the difficulty of having not good but fair hands is overcome. Again, he must keep in mind the fact that a horse being an animal of habit, if he is often checked at a fence will become either a refuser or slow and untrustworthy. The rider will spoil his mount, conversely, if he rushes wildly at every fence without rhyme or reason, and the horse will become a rushing, disagreeable animal. These are only examples for the purpose

of showing that, as riding is largely a matter of common sense, if a man habitually uses his intelligence he will become a much better rider than one who never thinks of the why and wherefore. Secondly, he should make himself, as much as possible, a part of his horse. The appearance of such a horseman has been described by Shakespeare with a force which cannot be surpassed:—

‘He grew unto his seat,
And to such wondrous doing brought his horse
As he had been incorpsed and demi-natured
With the brave beast.’

In other words, the horse and the rider should move together and in harmony. If the road riders of the Row be observed, it will be seen that the secret of the best riding is this keeping in harmony with the horse, and that the cause of bad riding is that this is not done. It requires a firm grip of the saddle with the legs, so that the body from the hips moves in unison with the horse. Thus, if, for example, the horse stops suddenly, the rider who is not in this state of harmony with the horse is thrown forward; if, on the contrary, his body is alive to the movements of the horse, his balance is preserved. For the same reason, he is in touch with the mouth of his horse: he ‘feels’ it, as the phrase is; he does not drag against it on the one hand, or lose all perception of it on the other. There is, again, the loose, easy rider, the opposite of the stiff horseman. He is in a sense equally unskilful, for he has no control over his horse, and he is altogether out of touch with him. This ‘constant communication’ between horse and rider is essentially and primarily to be sought after. The man who holds to this rule

‘has always a feeling on his horse’s mouth, but never holds on by it. He can tell by the feel of his horse if he contemplates doing anything out of the common, and can nearly always forestall him without the horse seeming to be aware of it. He is always carried well and pleasantly. If his horse should by any means be startled, and take a jump to one side or the other, he goes with him, and does not pull his mouth about—in fact, it would appear that horse and man were one machine, possessed of one mind between them. If many people who keep horses—it would be too much to say, who *ride* them—once got to understand how agreeable is the feeling of a horse going pleasantly and evenly into his bridle without pulling, at the same time feeling, as it were, every motion of the horse, they would never be satisfied with one that was not broken, and would try to keep him up to the mark when once they really understood what riding meant.’ (P. 137.)

. There may be some who think that to seek after skill in horsemanship is not a very worthy object, and that it is enough to be capable of merely guiding and sitting on a horse. But, after all, if a thing is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well, and to have an object of attainment adds to the pleasure of an exercise, whether of amusement or utility. Nor can the importance of all equestrian exercises at the present time be overrated. They are the counterpoises of the nervous tension which is a characteristic of modern life. We may properly criticise the wholesale devotion which some give to them, but this is a natural and necessary consequence of their mere existence. The advantages derivable from them are far greater than any results of their exaggeration. They produce mental and bodily sanity. They must be regarded as the natural outburst of physical energy, activity, and health; and if they are considered in this light, it is obvious that their cultivation and increase must result in a permanent national gain.

- ART. III.—1. *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ.* Translated from the German of JOHN J. I. DÖLLINGER by N. DANIELL, M.A. 2 vols. London: 1862.
2. *The First Age of Christianity and the Church.* By J. I. VON DÖLLINGER. Translated by H. N. OXENHAM. Third Edition. London: 1877.
3. *Akademische Vorträge.* Von J. VON DÖLLINGER. 3 Bände. München: 1888–1891.
4. *Studies in European History.* (A Translation of Vol. I. of the preceding work.) Translated by M. WARRE. London: 1890.
5. *Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters.* Von IGN. v. DÖLLINGER. Zweite Auflage. 1890.
6. *Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Era.* By IGN. v. DÖLLINGER. Translated by A. PLUMMER. London: 1873.
7. *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees.* By IGN. v. DÖLLINGER. Authorised Translation. Edinburgh: 1890.
8. *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches.* By IGN. v. DÖLLINGER. Translated by H. N. OXENHAM. London: 1872.
9. *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters.* Von I. v. DÖLLINGER. 2 Bände. München: 1890.
10. *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der Römisch-Katholischen Kirche seit dem XVI. Jahrhundert.* Bearbeitet von IGN. v. DÖLLINGER und F. H. REUSCH. 2 Bände. 1890.
11. *Ignaz von Döllinger: Erinnerungen.* Von LUISE VON KOBELL. München: 1891.
12. *Recollections of Dr. Döllinger.* By A. PLUMMER, in Vols. I. and II. of the *Expositor*, Series IV. 1890.

MANY men have attained eminence in history by being identified with successful causes. A few choice spirits have gained enduring celebrity by embodying in their own persons, so far as the movements they have originated are concerned, magnificent failures. They stirred the surface of theology, or science, or politics, like the waters of Bethesda, and having imparted to them a transient vitalising effect, they disappear, leaving the pool to relapse to its normal

stagnation. Rienzi, Arnold of Brescia, John Hus, Savonarola, Mirabeau, may stand for examples of leaders of that kind. In our own time the most illustrious instance is undoubtedly Döllinger. He gave both existence and a genuine historical *raison d'être* to the movement which rejected the Papal claim to infallibility, and his death robbed it of one great source of its permanent vitality.

It may easily happen that the leader of a forlorn cause may possess more permanent interest than the movement with which he is identified, and have personal claims to fame wholly independent of such movement. Both the fame and fascination of Savonarola have long survived the curious asceticism with which his name is associated, and Mirabeau has claims to the recognition of posterity as an orator and politician, apart from his failure to establish a constitutional monarchy for France. Similarly Döllinger has earned the esteem and veneration of the coming ages apart from his connexion with the Old Catholic movement. As the greatest Catholic theologian and the most learned Church historian in Germany during the present century his fame is assuredly secure, and would have been certain, even if his virtues and attainments had not produced their legitimate effect in bringing about a breach with Ultramontane Romanism.

A complete biography of Döllinger is not likely to be forthcoming for some time; we are compelled, therefore, to rely upon the collections of reminiscences, reviews, and newspaper articles which have appeared on the subject. Chiefest for English readers are the biographical data in Lord Acton's paper in the 'English Historical Review' (October 1890), and the five chapters of 'Recollections' which Dr. Plummer has contributed to the 'Expositor' (Vols. I. and II. Series IV.). But of still more importance, though as yet untranslated, are the reminiscences brought together by Madame von Kobell. They are recollections of conversations which the authoress and her husband were privileged to enjoy with Döllinger for nearly twelve years, in the course of weekly walks in the English Garden at Munich. It may even be doubted whether the future is destined to provide us with more facts of a substantial interest relating to Döllinger. His intellectual and spiritual life is of course contained in his written works, the more important of them being enumerated at the head of this paper. His personal characteristics, which seem to have exercised a peculiar charm on all who came within the magnetic circle of their influence, his conversational powers,

the routine of his daily life and studies, the outward setting and adornment, in short, which contribute to the human interest as well as the beauty and harmony of a noble life, these we find amassed in sufficient bulk and variety to render an addition to them for purposes of literary portraiture almost superfluous.

Döllinger was born at Bamberg on February 28, 1799. He was the eldest son of the then famous professor of anatomy and physiology. 'When the University of Bamberg came to an end in 1803,' to quote Dr. Plummer, 'his father, who had been professor of medicine there, was translated to Würzburg, where he remained for twenty years, and then moved to Munich, which was not yet the seat of a university, but became so in 1826.' We are told that the young Ignatius began to learn Latin when he was only five years old, and commenced two years later the study of Greek. Dr. Plummer informs us that his father acquired the latter language in order to teach his son, because there was no adequate Greek teacher in Würzburg at that time. Of his father's Greek tuition we have the following anecdote:—

'The boy made mistakes in his exercises, and these tried his father's temper. After a series of perhaps specially faulty exercises had been produced, the father threatened him that, unless the next was done without a mistake, he would abandon the attempt to make a scholar of him and give him the choice of a *trade*. The boy never doubted either that there would be mistakes or that his father would keep his word. He lay awake choosing his trade, and decided on that of a bookbinder. But the next exercise was free from mistakes, and the bookbinders lost an interesting apprentice.'

In Madame von Kobell's reminiscences we have another anecdote on the same subject. Young Döllinger used to be chosen by his Greek class mates to expose the ignorance of the university teacher. One day he got from his father a box on the ear because the teacher had complained to him that his son was in the habit of making grimaces when he was engaged in teaching Greek.

Of more importance, as indicating the future of the great theologian, is the statement that the boy used to accompany his mother to church with the utmost regularity. She appears to have been somewhat of a devotee, and while her devotions were protracted to long hours her little boy used to pray and abandon himself to the pious and poetical emotions by which Roman Catholicism endeavours to impress the susceptibilities of her sensitive members. This Pietistic direction

of his tastes was further manifested by his ordinary occupations, for, although Dr. Plummer informs us that 'he was 'then fond of entomology,' the predilection could not have been very profound, inasmuch as we learn from Madame von Kobell that 'he often preferred reading books of 'Catholic devotion and discipline to hunting after beetles 'and butterflies.' His father encouraged his thirst for knowledge partly by formal teaching, partly by conversation. Only upon all questions of theology the elder Döllinger was discreetly and inflexibly silent. He used to reply to his son's eager 'speerings' by such admissions as 'That I do not know,' or 'That no man knows;' but the outcome of this profession of nescience in one special department of human inquiry was to convince his son that theology was the entrance gate to wider knowledge.

'I thought to myself when I was a boy, if I learnt theology I should know and understand much, and the idea took such hold of me that I soon had no other prepossession than that of becoming a theologian. I thought, however, not so much of the clergy as of the professors of theology. I also chose that position as a basis of what was knowable, and I cherished, like Socrates, the expectation of arriving by industry and application at the limits of human knowledge; but, alas! how far am I behind that which I then hoped to attain!'

With her strongly marked Pictistic instincts Madame Döllinger naturally encouraged her son's predilection for theology, which his father, however, qualified by adding to it the study of jurisprudence. At Würzburg he attended lectures on the history of law, by Professor Brendel, who was also—the remark seems worth noting in reference to Döllinger—the author of a work on ecclesiastical law. Brendel's readings were insufferably tedious, and, combined with his wretched monotone delivery, disgusted the young student with the study of jurisprudence. In after life he used to say that if he had gone to Berlin, and heard the lectures of Savigny and Eichhorn, he would probably have become a jurist.

'It was during the early Würzburg days,' says Dr. Plummer, 'that he laid the foundations of that extraordinary command of modern languages which so distinguished him in after life. He learnt the elements of English from one of the last remaining Benedictines in the old Scotch monastery at Würzburg, and among the first English books which he studied were the "Vicar of Wakefield" and the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." The way in which he learnt French, and probably Italian, is still more interesting.'

i.e. he seems to have acquired the rudiments of those languages from the French and Italian soldiers of Napoleon who were quartered at Würzburg. Three or four of these soldiers were billeted on his mother, who had to lodge and feed them.

Döllinger's congenital idiosyncrasy and surroundings being what we have now ascertained them to be, it would seem superfluous to search for a special incentive to his life career as a theologian. The Countess Montalembert, however, was persuaded that Döllinger's devotion to a subject so closely allied with clerical celibacy was due to a disappointment in love! A suggestion in more ludicrous contrast with the probabilities of the case it would be scarcely possible to imagine. One day she took occasion to sound him as to the particulars of this supposed romance. Döllinger admitted that when he was a student he fell in love with a buxom, handsome girl; but a rival, favoured by her father, was a suitor at the same time; and, as he himself was nothing, and had nothing, an inward impulse irresistibly forced him to theology, whereupon, he continues, in language which reminds us of Gibbon's sublime renunciation, 'I sighed as 'a lover, I obeyed as a son'—'I resigned my love fancy' (*Schwärmerci*), and the maiden married the other.' The Countess was not satisfied with an explanation which seemed to place the attractions of theology so nearly on a par with those of womanhood, and so, continued Döllinger, 'my contrary assurances that I was romantic neither in early life nor since all went for nothing. The Countess remained convinced that it was an unfortunate love affair that induced me to adopt the calling of theologian. What could you effect,' he added, 'against the determined opinion of a woman?'

Among other recollections of his earlier life Döllinger used to call to mind his first celebration of the Mass, and the pleasure it gave to his mother and grandmother. It is characteristic of his relation to purely clerical functions that he adds, 'I thought more of them in the matter than of myself.'

In the year 1823 he was appointed professor at the Lyceum at Aschaffenburg, and three years later, in 1826, he obtained the post with which his name will always be identified, that of Professor of Church History and Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence in the University of Munich.

We are here entering upon that period of marvellous literary activity on which his fame as the most erudite theo-

logian and ecclesiastical historian of modern times on the Romanist side depends. Later on we shall have to place before our readers a general *résumé* of his labours in this department. We have the less reason to consider the subject here, because, for a considerable portion of this Munich professorial period, Döllinger was busily engaged in elaborating arguments and formulating conclusions which more matured study compelled him to unlearn and disown. All his earlier works, whether on Church history or dogma, are to be read by the additional, often vehemently contrasted, light of his later researches, and hence his name continues to be identified with works—notably his ‘History of the Reformation’ and ‘The First Age of the Church’—which no longer represent his ultimate conclusions. For the present we are still engaged in tracing Döllinger’s mental and spiritual developement.

From the year 1826 to about 1861 Döllinger was, if not an Ultramontane Catholic, at least favourably disposed towards that conception of the Papacy and its principle of developement. Sufficient causes may, however, be assigned for this inchoate stage in his mental progress. First, his own investigations into the broad field of ecclesiastical history had not as yet sufficed to supply him with the requisite arguments and data for the impartial determination of the principles and results of this personal outcome of Papal growth. Secondly, his own mental powers, though originally virile enough, had been overstrained and perverted by the excessive deference to ecclesiastical authority which is the bane of all Romanist education, and had not yet attained sufficient strength and independence for the calm and self-centred survey which he finally bestowed on the whole question of the history and modern policy of the Papacy.

By degrees, however, Döllinger’s Ultramontane fever began to subside, and the subsidence disclosed itself by a gradually more pronounced and critical attitude in reference to the Jesuits and their creature the Pope. Soon the modification of opinion manifested itself in overt forms. Thus in the year 1861, in the course of some lectures delivered at Munich, he speculated on the probability of a complete secularisation of the Papal States and the beneficial consequences of such a change for the Church itself. On the same theme he wrote to his friend Montalembert, ‘I am sorely dissatisfied: there is so much in the Church that has turned out otherwise than I expected, and painted in the rose tints of imagination, twenty or thirty years ago.’

In truth, Döllinger had now come to perceive the seamy side of Papal as distinct from Catholic Christianity, especially the effect of its hierarchical pretensions on the conscience, freedom, and general wellbeing of humanity. Originally his conception of the starting point and evolution of Romanism did not differ materially from that which Newman subsequently elaborated in his treatise on 'Developement.' We find it set forth, firstly, in his 'Rede über Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der katholischen Theologie,' p. 24. We employ Mr. Oxenham's translation:—

'The Catholic theologian cannot but regard the whole course of the Church in the light of a grand process of developement, a continual growth from within; not the growth of a tapeworm, but of a tree, into which the mustard seed of the Apostolic age has expanded. He cannot arbitrarily choose a period here or there and content himself with studying that, but must investigate the Church in the entirety of her outward life and historical continuity from the beginning until now.'

This is not the place to discuss the theory thus set forth, with more plausibility than power, by Döllinger while still in the benighted stage of Ultramontane Romanism. Apart from the fact that he lived to disown—so far as it describes the constitution of the Church—the work from which this extract is taken, the doctrine itself has received for all reasonable men its ratiocinative quietus. We need only name for English thinkers the works of Archer Butler and Dr. Salmon dealing with this subject. Indeed, the amount of logical argumentation expended on so obvious a paralogism from first to last does not prepossess us with a high opinion of the general average of theological culture either among Protestants or Romanists. Except among Pietists and fanatics, or thinkers endowed either with exorbitant powers of credulity or mental reservation, the doctrine of the Developement of Romanist Dogma on the lines of absolute and infallible truth must be pronounced virtually extinct. With the limitations before mentioned to intelligent and rational beings the belief is just as impossible as the most grotesque superstition which ever invoked the verification of the human reason, as the belief, e.g., of our forefathers in witches, the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, or the efficacy of the royal touch for the king's evil. It is contradicted by reason, by Scripture, by history, by science—by every authority, in short, to which civilised and Christian men are accustomed to defer.

That Döllinger found himself compelled to take a modified

attitude on this question is certain. Equally certain is it that the modification was of slow growth. Surveying the field of ecclesiastical history with an originally unprejudiced and ingenuous mind, with a profound conviction of the supremacy of truth, with broad human sympathies, and with a statesmanlike insight into the causes, mental and religious, as well as material and physical, of the prosperity or decadence of nations, he could not but take exception to the actual products of what he considered the doctrinal starting points of the Christian Church. That the many crimes and scandals of Papal rule—the horrors of the Inquisition, the immoral teaching of the Jesuits, the crusade against the Albigenses, the suppression of the Templars—to name only a few of the cases on which Döllinger himself was accustomed to lay stress—could be regarded as natural products of the teaching of Christ, was an inference too monstrous to be entertained for a moment by any sane man. The germs of which these transactions were the legitimate offspring might no doubt be traced to their real origin, but that origin was not the Gospel nor the Sermon on the Mount. There was thus, as Döllinger admitted, a total lack of continuity and consistency between Christianity and its Papal developement. Doctrines in their origin useful or harmless were unscrupulously perverted, so as to subserve the greed and aggrandisement of the Papacy. Indeed, all the advocates of the doctrine of developement, we may note in passing, rely upon a fallacious analogy. While the products of physical germs are inevitable and constant, there is no law of the growth of spiritual and moral principles which can determine irrevocably their ultimate results. Being themselves capable of various modifications, they are necessarily exposed to the countless perversions which human selfishness and ambition can bring to bear on them. It would be impossible for the most reasonable advocate of the doctrine of ecclesiastical developement to name a single germ, whether of teaching or conduct, which an unscrupulous sacerdotalism could not pervert and falsify.

Döllinger soon came to perceive that in the historical evolution of the Christian Church there was a twofold developement—the one true, the other altogether false and spurious. The first was exemplified to him by the Church Catholic of early times and the great councils; the second was manifested by the Papacy, especially of late mediæval and modern times. The Doctrine of Developement, whose special function it was to unify in an harmonious natural

growth the earlier and later stages of doctrinal evolution, had proved a source of disunion and violent partition. Thus there was a gradual sundering in Döllinger's mind of what had once been a single undivided conception. His old ideal of an indivisible, beneficent, self-developing spiritual power was crumbling to dust. Papal Christianity, as it existed under the sway of the Jesuits, and sustained by the Inquisition, was nothing else than a diabolically gendered moustrosity. The causes of this perversion were twofold—the one general, the other special.

1. The general causes were the worldliness and selfishness, the lust of wealth, power, and aggrandisement of which Rome had for centuries been the centre. To pursue in every direction this theme, to point out in each single division and ramification its ruinous results on the Church and Christianity, may be described as the task of the greater portion of Döllinger's life. Here his vast learning, especially his researches into the bypaths and obscure recesses of ecclesiastical history, found ample scope. We need only refer our readers to those volumes of 'Akademische Vorträge' and the two large volumes entitled 'Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters' to prove his indefatigable industry and immense erudition in this department of learning. Though he died as he had lived, a liberal Catholic theologian, few Protestants, and not one single Catholic, could be named who have contributed so much to the controversy between the Papacy and Protestants. His works form an inexhaustible storehouse of facts and arguments on the relations between the rival Churches. At the same time we must admit that the general principles and main positions in this controversy are not new. The mingled outcry of anathemas and laments over the simony, the worldliness, the immorality, the many-sided turpitude of the Rome of the Popes had re-echoed over Europe for many centuries. All that Döllinger himself could do was to reiterate the old wail and to demonstrate its justifiableness by fresh and startling revelations.

2. More closely connected with his own opinions and the attitude he was destined to take in opposition to the Papacy were the special causes of modern Papal corruption, on which he bestowed particular attention and which may be summed up in the rise and growth of the Jesuits. In conjunction with his friend Dr. Reusch, Döllinger, during the last ten years of his life, entered upon a fuller investigation of this theme, which had always for him a profound interest.

His researches took the form not so much of a general history of the order as of the controversies on moral questions with which it was largely occupied in the sixteenth and two following centuries. The result of this collaboration was published two years ago under the title '*Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der Römisch-Katholischen Kirche*,' and consists of two portly volumes containing altogether nearly 1,100 pages. It may be described generally as an elaborate indictment of the order, and, regarded from this point of view, no more damning impeachment of a professedly religious society has ever appeared in the world's history. It is true that, as regards the main results of the inquiry, the work had been anticipated by Pascal's '*Provincial Letters*;' but the Jesuitical arguments and immoral casuistry which Pascal exposed with all the brilliancy of his incomparable style, and the incisiveness of his keen wit and irony in his immortal satire, are here adduced in a narrative historical form and supported by documentary evidence set forth with the impartial cold-blooded calmness of State Papers. We wish we had the requisite space to place before our readers some of the facts and conclusions detailed in this remarkable book. We can only refer those interested in the question to the work itself. No abler *exposé* of Jesuitism from the historical standpoint has ever appeared. After reading it we are able to appreciate the new departure which the Order has taken by the promulgation of the Vatican decrees. We are also better able to understand the daring boast of Caramuel de Lobkovicz, one of their leading doctors: '*Tota Theologia nostra nova est. Non multum temporis perdo in veterum libris legendis.*'

The general result of Döllinger's Jesuit researches—we are speaking of the years prior to 1870—was to open his eyes to the startling potentialities involved in a weak Pope and an unscrupulous Curia governed wholly by the Jesuits and the Ultramontane faction. That they were capable of promulgating new dogmas, unreasonable in themselves and derogatory to religion, constituted but a small part of their sinister ability. He knew that there was no intrigue too base, no falsehood too great, no machination too unworthy to be adopted for the accomplishment of their ends. From the moment when the question of the Vatican Council was first mooted Döllinger seems to have had profound misgivings as to the result, and he grounded his apprehension on his intimate knowledge of the frauds and falsifications to which Papal Rome had stooped in the far past, and the utter un-

scrupulousness with which the disciples of Liguori were prepared to carry out their projects in the near present.

We are now coming to the great crisis of Döllinger's life—the supreme decision that was destined to affect his whole after career, and to form no small part of his renown in the coming centuries—the moment that was to test whether the love of truth or devotion to ecclesiasticism in its extreme form was the stronger in him.

If in some fictitious narrative of an imaginary New Atlantis we found a description of a certain race of mortals closely resembling man in intelligence and opportunities for acquiring knowledge, which, numbering many millions, proposed solemnly and decisively to credit a single individual of their race—rather below than above the average of intellectuality—with the attribute of unerring knowledge, and with the power of enforcing such a belief on his fellow mortals by a special religious ostracism, we should undoubtedly credit the author's imagination with inventions as inherently improbable as a description of

‘Gorgons and Hydras and Chimæras dire.’

Such a narrative, however, in intrinsic and many-sided unlikelihood ranks infinitely below the central event in the history of Roman Catholicism during the present century. We mean the calling of the Vatican Council, and the promulgation as an article of faith of the infallibility of the Pope. The event has already become part of European history: it is a fact as undeniably certain as the battle of Waterloo or the Franco-German war; otherwise it is so unique in the world's history, so alien to the normal procedures and beliefs of civilised humanity, that it seems to need some extraordinary hypothesis to account for it. Perhaps with the further advance of human culture and enlightenment for two centuries to come the historian of the twenty-first century, in his retrospect of the nineteenth, will adduce the Vatican decrees and the proclamation of the Pope's infallibility as a curious and interesting proof of an epidemic aberration of the human reason, akin, e.g., to the insanity which initiated and sustained the Crusades. As a verification of his theory he might urge the fact that the Pontiff thus credited with supernatural knowledge and immunity from error never supplied a more cogent demonstration of his powers than the utterance of foolish asseverations or of feeble religious platitudes, that he never supplied from the superhuman light of his infallibility a

single illuminating ray to the many sources of human error, that he never solved a single enigma or propounded a single new truth that might bear the test of scientific investigation.

But whatever be the decision of posterity on an event unparalleled in the religious history of civilised men, its influence on Döllinger's life and on the subsequent growth of his opinions was momentous. Yet it would be wrong to assume, as some writers have done, that his disruption with the Papacy was an extraordinary event, or that it formed a solution of the continuity of his mental and spiritual development. Indeed, our main purpose in the preceding remarks has been to place before our readers the intellectual and general evolution which rendered his resolute stand against the Vatican decrees a moral certainty. Everything in his past contributed to prepare him for the part he was now destined to play; the direction of his studies, his aptitudes as a statesman and a jurist, the growth and maturing of his personal character, his unswerving loyalty to truth, his ideal of the Church catholic as a spiritual power, his conviction of the absolute need of liberality and comprehension in all questions of opinion, each and all were factors which found in his opposition to Ultramontanism their natural outcome. Like Luther, whose supreme step of nailing his theses to the door of Würzburg Cathedral was but the inevitable sequel of long years of intellectual exertion and gradually maturing resolution, Döllinger's final breach with Papal Christianity was but the natural consummation of all his prior life and energy. 'One often goes a long way,' he said to Madame von Kobell, 'and then suddenly and unexpectedly arrives at a point where one makes a halt because his conscience forbids him to go further. So it befell me with this dogma' (the Pope's infallibility).

The history of this great crisis in Döllinger's life is fully set forth in the collection of detached notes and letters translated into English under the title 'Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees.' It is an admirable series of *pièces justificatives*, or, using the author's own description when he projected the work, a well-ordered array of arguments and facts ('*aciem argumentorum et factorum instructam*'), which places in the clearest possible light Döllinger's position, and gives no inconsiderable insight into the intellectual character and mode of thought of which that position was the definitive result. The events to which the book refers, and of which it presupposes the knowledge,

are too recent and too well known to render needful more than the barest summary of them; and dealing as we are only with Döllinger's life and his personal attitude to the Vatican decrees, we do not propose to enter upon those larger aspects of the controversy and the writings they evoked—such as, e.g., the famous 'The Pope and the Council,' by Janus, in which Döllinger's share as a collaborator with others is not always easy to discriminate. We regard the book we have just mentioned, and to which we propose asking our readers' attention, as Döllinger's own authoritative presentation of all the facts and arguments relating to the Council so far as they concerned himself. Their authority in the question appears to us increased by the circumstance that they are documents drawn up and collected not in the very heat and hurry of the controversy, but twenty years after the event to which they owe their origin. To the future biographer of Döllinger or the Church historian of the nineteenth century they are indispensable.

The succession of events to which the book alludes may be summarised as follows. We quote a few sentences from Professor Kurtz's admirable compendium of Church History:—

'Immediately after Pius IX. had, at the centenary of St. Peter in 1867, given a hint that a general council might be summoned, the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" (the organ of the Jesuits and the Roman Curia) stated that the most prominent questions for discussion would be the sanctioning the doctrine of Papal absolutism in the spirit of the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. and the proclamation of Papal infallibility. The "*Civiltà*" had already taught that "when the Pope thinks it is God who thinks in him." *

The formal summons for the Council was issued on June 29, 1868. Its object was stated as follows:—

'the saving of the Church and civil society from all evils threatening them, the thwarting of the endeavours of all who seek the overthrow of Church and State, the uprooting of all modern errors, and the downfall of all godless enemies of the Apostolical Chair.'

But the real object of the Council had already been clearly divined, and it evoked a number of protests from every quarter. Among the rest,

'Count Montalembert energetically protested in a publication of March 7, 1870, six days before his death, against the intrigues of the

* English Translation, vol. iii. pp. 249-52,

Jesuits and the infallibility dogma which it was proposed to authorise.'

The organisation of the Council was itself a demonstration of the impious farce it was convened to enact.

'Of 1,014 prelates entitled to take part in the Council 767 made their appearance, of whom 276 were Italians and 119 bishops *in partibus*, all pliable satellites of the Curia, as were also the greater number of the missionary bishops, who, with their assistants in the Propaganda, were supported at the cost of the Holy Father. The 62 bishops of the Papal States were doubly subject to the Pope, and of the 80 Spanish and South American bishops it was affirmed in Rome that they would be ready at the bidding of the Pope to define the Trinity as consisting of four persons. Forty Italian cardinals and 20 generals of orders were equally dependable. The Romance races were represented by no less than 600, the German by no more than 14. For the first time since General Councils were held was the laity entirely excluded from all share in the proceedings, even the ambassadors of Catholic and tolerant Powers. The order of business drawn up by the Pope (against which Döllinger made a vigorous protest in "Declarations and Letters," p. 46) was arranged in all its details so as to cripple the opposition. The right of all the fathers of the Council to make proposals was indeed conceded, but a committee chosen by the Pope decided as to their admissibility. . . . Instead of the unanimity required by the Canon Law in matters of faith a simple majority of votes was declared sufficient. A formal protest of the minority against these and similar unconstitutional proposals was left quite unheeded. . . . The *Schema of the Church* came up for consideration on May 10. The discussion turned first and mainly on the fourth article, about the infallibility of the Pope. Its Biblical foundation was sought in Luke xxii. 32 . . . but the main stress was laid on its necessarily following from the position of the Pope as the representative of Christ.'

If in any one respect the Pope evinced some rudiments of that infallibility with which he was about to be credited, it was in his conviction of the average fallibility of his clerical subordinates when solicited by bribes or menaced by the loss of their temporal interests. With a cynical disbelief in human virtue and consistency which can only be compared to Walpole's persuasion that 'every man has 'his price,' he, with his Jesuit coadjutors, employed every means that deceit, chicanery, or unscrupulousness could suggest in order to break down the opposition and carry his point. Professor Kurtz says:—

'By seductive kindness he won some, by sharp angry words he terrified others. He denounced opponents as sectarian enemies of the Church and Apostolic Chair, and styled them ignoramuses, slaves of princes, and cowards. He invoked the aid of the Blessed Virgin to

ward off threatened division. To the question whether he himself regarded the formulating of the dogma as opportune he answered, "No, but as necessary." Urged by the Jesuits, he confidently declared that it was notorious that the whole Church at all times taught the absolute infallibility of the Pope; and on another occasion he silenced a modest doubt as to a sure tradition with the dictatorial words, "La tradizione sono io," an autocratic though ridiculous imitation of Napoleon's "L'état c'est moi."

He even dared to base his claim of infallibility on a change of consciousness which he had experienced in becoming Pope. He said, 'Per l'infallibilità, essendo l'Abate Mastai l'ho sempre creduto; adesso, essendo Papa Mastai, la sento' ('As to the infallibility, as a simple clergyman I always believed it; now as Pope I feel it'). This, from a scientific standpoint, must be taken as the most interesting psychological deliverance that the world has ever known, though it is obvious that an assertion of a subjective condition of consciousness cannot be accepted as a proof of its existence. The only parallel that we can recall to such a supernatural consciousness is suggested by the Emperor Vespasian's dying words in allusion to his approaching apotheosis—'I think I am about becoming a god'—though it is true this persuasion of a decaying and moribund sensibility was ironical.

'On July 13' (we again quote Professor Kurtz) 'the final vote was called for in the general congregation. There were 371 who simply voted *placet*, 61 *placet juxta modum*—i.e. with certain modifications—and 88 *non placet*. After a last hopeless attempt by a deputation to obtain the Pope's consent to a milder formulating of the decree, the 150 hitherto steadfast members of the minority returned home, after putting forth a written declaration that they must continue to adhere to their negative vote, but from reverence for the person of the Pope they declined to give effect to it at a public session. On July 18 the fourth and last sitting was held: 547 fathers voted *placet*, and only two—Riccio of Cajazzo and Fitzgerald of Little Rock—*non placet*. A violent storm had broken out during the session, and amid thunder and lightning Pius IX., like a second Moses (Exodus xix. 16), proclaimed in the *Pastor æternus* the absolute plenipotence and infallibility of himself and of all his predecessors and successors.'

Thus ended the most remarkable episode in the history of the Papacy during the nineteenth century—an episode on which a future of more widely diffused enlightenment will, we venture to predict, look back with wonderment as a stupendous example of human fatuity and impiety on the one hand and credulity and imbecility on the other.

The moment of the promulgation of the Papal decree was ominous and menacing. The Sinaitic thunder and lightning, in which Infallibilists detected a similarity between Moses and Pio Nono—the lawgiver of the Jews and the Papal puppet of the Jesuits—was evidently capable of a more sinister explanation. It was on the evening preceding the proclamation of this new dogma that Napoleon III. proclaimed war with Prussia, in consequence of which the Pope lost the last remnants of his temporal sovereignty and every chance of its restoration. Moreover the political agitation thus set on foot had also—as such civil commotions not unfrequently have—a moral and spiritual effect; and the power of the Papacy in Italy among its most cultivated and enlightened citizens has, since 1870, steadily decreased. We may count it as one of the most striking examples of the irony of human events that the proclamation of the Papal Infallibility demonstrated nothing so much as the crass fallibility of its authors.

We are now, by means of this brief *résumé*, in a better position to understand Döllinger's 'Declarations and Letters,' as well as to follow the remainder of a career which had received from this crisis a new impulse as well as in many respects a new form.

The first document in the book is entitled 'Considerations for the Bishops of the Council respecting the Doctrine of 'Papal Infallibility.' It consists of a series of learned and well-reasoned arguments demonstrating, in opposition to the daring assertions of the Jesuits, that Papal infallibility in the sense in which it was proclaimed by the Vatican decrees had always been unknown in the Church. Among other convincing arguments establishing this position we select the following :—

§ 3. 'In the writings of the ecclesiastical Fathers who treat of the rule of Faith and the authority of the Church—viz. in the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, Gennadius, and Vincent of Lerins—no reference is ever made to the judgement of the Romish See or to the decisions of the Popes, nor is it mentioned that there existed such a simple means of abruptly terminating doctrinal disputes as the consulting of the infallible Papal dictum. All these Fathers only know of the traditions of the Church with the three conditions and marks of genuineness—viz. universality, antiquity, and general consent.'

This may stand as an example of Döllinger's negative proofs on the question; the following is as nearly a positive proof as anything can well be :—

§ 13. 'Pope Honorius was condemned at the Sixth General Council on the charge of heresy. This condemnation was at once accepted by the whole Church without the slightest opposition. His successor sanctioned and signed it. No one, with the single exception of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, offered a word in his defence, and no one appealed to the infallibility of the Popes in matters of faith. It is as clear as day that at that time the conception of such an infallibility was a thing totally unknown to the whole Christian world.'

These are fair specimens of a chain of ratiocination consisting altogether of twenty-six strongly welded and conjoined links, each of them a fair, solidly based, and learnedly attested argument, the cumulative force of which no unprejudiced reader would, in our opinion, be able to withstand.

But Döllinger is not satisfied with proving the novelty and untraditional character of the new dogma; he attacks in other declarations and letters everything pertaining to the Council—the Jesuit intrigues and machinations which suggested it, the manner of convening it—the 'muzzling order' by which the Pope and the Jesuits were determined to stifle and crush all opposition to the infallibility decree. On this last point of the servile passivity to which the Council was ultimately reduced Döllinger delivers himself with merited severity. In a letter to Archbishop von Scherr he says (p. 96)—

'In the whole history of the Church among those Councils that have the reputation of being universal I am only aware of one at which, as at the recent Council, the men in power prevented a thorough discussion of tradition, and that is the Second Council of Ephesus in 449 A.D. There at the so-called Robber Synod, it took place with violence and tumultuous tyranny; at the Vatican Council it was the order of business imposed on the assembly, the Papal commission, and the will of the majority that did not suffer a proper and thorough examination, which, it is true, would have brought some very troublesome and disagreeable things to light, but it would have also preserved the Church from a confusion which seems lamentable even in your eyes. . . . A Council is only theologically "free" when there is a free examination and discussion of all scruples and difficulties, and when the objections are admitted and examined according to the rules required by the ascertainment of tradition.'

He falls foul both of the intellectual capacity and ethical fitness of the majority of the bishops.

'That to this end (free examination of tradition) not even the most modest beginning has been made, and that indeed the immense majority of bishops from the Roman countries lacked either the will or the proper discernment for separating truth from falsehood, right from wrong, is proved by the writings which have appeared in Italy, and which have been distributed in Rome—as, e.g., those of Ghilardi

the Dominican and Bishop of Mondovi. This is also further proved by the fact that hundreds of these bishops could, without blushing, appeal to the inviolable authority of Alphonso Liguori.'

We have quoted this passage at length because it summarises Döllinger's tone and method of reasoning on this subject, and sets forth with a justifiable *sæva indignatio* some of his weightiest arguments.

But while it is impossible to deny either the learning or ratiocinative force of Döllinger's argument, and while fully conceding that as a Catholic he had hardly any resource but to pursue this line of reasoning, we may be permitted to point out that he relies too exclusively on antiquity, tradition, and precedent in issues capable of decision on wholly intrinsic and independent grounds. He does not realise with sufficient distinctness the inevitable tendency of all hierarchical pretension to undermine the intellect, the veracity of conscience, the sense of responsibility, of all who submit to its thralldom; and the consequent need of opposing its claims long before they have attained their climax of aggressiveness. For centuries the discipline of Romanism had been based on the complete surrender of the reason and conscience of its votaries. Some of the most prominent of its dogmas appear to have been devised and put forward with the express object of insisting on such a surrender. Indeed, they demand not only the subjugation of the reason, but the suppression or denial of the elementary facts of consciousness. In common with most thinkers nurtured on Romanism or other ecclesiasticisms, Döllinger did not perceive that the most rudimentary stage of this self-surrender is pregnant with mischief. The abandonment of a man's faculties, the evidence of his senses, the outcome of his experience is *ipso facto* the abandonment of his veracity. The very attempt to discuss 'the nicely calculated less or more' of such a surrender is prejudicial to honesty and an invasion of the supremest and most inalienable duties of humanity.

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the Vatican decrees than the almost complete unanimity with which they were accepted. The dissidents bore a scarcely larger proportion to the acquiescent majority than one in ten thousand. In truth, the whole method and training of Romanism, the passive acceptance of startling and contradictory dogmas, such as that of the Immaculate Conception, the surrender implied by them in varying proportion of the clearest deter-

minations of the senses and the most cogent conclusions of the reason, had prepared the Church for this last and most fatuous dogma of all.

Döllinger used to say that the infallibility of the Pope had been accepted in earlier times as a pious opinion, but never as a dogma ('eine Meinung; aber nie ein Dogma'), adding, 'And what a gulf exists between an opinion and an article of faith!' Few theologians would probably dispute the existence of such a gulf; but few philosophers could be found who would not add that, as representing a psychological process in the mind of the individual believer, the chasm between an opinion and a dogma is not impassable; nay, more, they would probably insist that a dogma might be only an opinion *fully grown*, attested, and confirmed, i.e. by repeated assent, until, like other human beliefs, it assumes the aspect of undeniable truth. At any rate, our astonishment need not be overwhelming that men who had long cherished the opinion of the Pope's infallibility found no insuperable obstacle in accepting a dogma which gave that opinion a pronounced and undeniable form.

Returning now to the events in Döllinger's life which followed the Vatican Council, the decree of the Pope's infallibility was promulgated, we have seen, on July 18, 1870. It was at once followed by the outburst of the storm of which it had long been the generating and menacing nucleus. 'In the beginning of August'—we again quote Professor Kurtz—'the hitherto exemplary Catholic Professor Michelis, of Braunsberg, issued a public charge against Pius IX. as a heretic and devourer of the Church, and by the end of August several distinguished theologians (Döllinger and Friederich of Munich among the rest) joined him at Nuremberg in making a public declaration that the Vatican Council could not be regarded as œcumenical nor its new dogma as a Catholic doctrine.' This statement was subscribed by forty-four Catholic professors of Munich, with the rector at their head, but without the theologians. Similarly several Catholic teachers in Breslau, Freiburg, Würzburg, and Berne protested, and still more energetically a gathering of Catholic laymen at Königswinter. The Bonn professors, Reusch, Langen, Hilgers, and Knoodt, also refused to subscribe the Council decrees at the call of their bishop. At Munich the archbishop, on October 20, sent a letter to the Faculty of Theology, calling on its professors to submit to the Vatican decrees, and threatening them, in case of refusal, with ecclesiastical penalties. All

submitted, with the exception of the two most eminent and learned of them all, Döllinger and Friederich. On January 4, 1871, the archbishop addressed himself to Döllinger, requiring his explicit avowal of assent to or dissent from the decrees of the Council. After some correspondence, continuing up to March, Döllinger, in a very remarkable letter, from which we have already made an extract, expressed his *non possumus* in the following firm and dignified terms:—

‘As Christian, as theologian, as historian, as citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine. I cannot do so as a Christian because it is incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel and with the lucid sayings of Christ and the Apostles; it simply wishes to establish the kingdom of this world, which Christ declined to do, and to possess the sovereignty over the congregations, which Peter refused for everyone else as well as for himself. I cannot do so as a theologian because the whole genuine tradition of the Church stands irreconcilably opposed to it. I cannot do so as an historian because as such I know that the persistent endeavour to realise this theory of a universal sovereignty has cost Europe streams of blood, distracted and ruined whole countries, shaken to its foundations the beautiful organic edifice of the constitution of the older Church, and begotten, nursed, and maintained the worst abuses in the Church. Finally, I must reject it as a citizen, because, with its claims on the submission of States and monarchs and the whole political order of things to the Papal power, and by the exceptional position claimed by it for the clergy, it lays the foundation for an endless and fatal discord between the State and the Church, between the clergy and the laity; for I cannot conceal from myself the fact that this doctrine, the consequences of which were the ruin of the old German Empire, in case it should become dominant in the Catholic part of the German nation, would at once plant the germ of an incurable disease in the recently restored Empire.’ (P. 103.)

In order to justify these political apprehensions he appends to his letter a quotation from the ‘*Civiltà Cattolica*’ of March 18, 1871:—

‘The Pope is the chief justice of the civil law. In him the two powers, spiritual and temporal, meet together as in their head; for he is the vicar of Christ, who is not only Eternal Priest, but also King of kings and Lord of lords.’

It is a significant comment on these impious and arrogant claims of the Pope, however much they may purport to be legitimate inferences from his alleged infallibility, that, as Professor Kurtz remarks—

‘no State as such has recognised the Council. Austria answered it by abolishing the Concordat and forbidding the proclamation of the decrees. Bavaria and Saxony refused their *placet*. Hesse, Baden, and Würtemberg declared that the conclusions of the Council had

no binding authority in law. Prussia . . . passed a series of laws in order to resume its too readily abandoned rights over the Catholic Church, and to ensure itself against further encroachments of Ultramontaniam upon the domain of civil life.'

As for Döllinger, had he lived three centuries earlier, the fate of Savonarola and Hus would undoubtedly have befallen him. As it was, the Church and its Infallible Head brought all its penal power to bear on him. He was sentenced to be excommunicated in the extremest form of that antiquated punishment on April 17, 1871. We subjoin the notice which the cathedral provost sent him of his doom. After detailing Döllinger's obstinacy, but withal admitting his indubitable services as a teacher, the sentence proceeds:—

'In consequence of all this, I say, for the salvation of your own soul and as a warning to others, the *excommunicatio major* being fixed by the ecclesiastical law for the *crimen hæreseos externæ et formalis*, and lately enacted by the General Vatican Council relative to its decrees of July 18 last, it has been necessary to pronounce the excommunication which you have, *ipso facto*, drawn down upon yourself through the above-mentioned offence against the Church by a special judicial sentence which will be made public, and of which I herewith give you notice.'

In accordance with this notice the sentence of excommunication was publicly proclaimed on July 23, 1870.

It was an event of European importance. Döllinger had for many years achieved the reputation of being the most learned among the Catholic professors, not only of Munich, but of Germany. Besides his learning, his personal character—at once dominating and attractive—had impressed itself on the sympathy and admiration of his fellow-citizens. The eyes of Christendom, both Catholic and Protestant, were fixed on the great professor both in expectation of his resolution and in confident anticipation that it would prove worthy of himself. Consequently the publication of his final resolve, followed, as it was, by his almost immediate excommunication, was the signal for extraordinary manifestations of popular applause. He was 'literally overwhelmed,' says Kurtz, 'with complimentary addresses from Vienna, Würzburg, Munich, and almost all the other cities of Bavaria, and 'an address to Government on the dangers to the State 'threatened by the Vatican decrees, that lay at the Munich 'Museum, was quickly filled with 12,000 signatures.' Another reply of still greater immediate significance was the first Congress of the Old Catholics, which was held at

Munich in September 1871, and was attended by 500 deputies from all parts of Germany.

It is difficult for a Protestant, accustomed to independent consideration and personal decision of religious as of other issues, to enter into the feelings of a man like Döllinger, compelled by the invincible behest of conscience to sever himself from the Church of his birth and early training, and to break in his own person those religious ties which he had long considered as his especial privilege. For the time being, no doubt, the wrench was severe. The sundering appeared all the more aggravating in that his excommunication was accomplished by the machinations of the Jesuits, whose mischievous influence on the Church he had so long deplored and exposed. 'He fully believed,' remarks Dr. Plummer, 'that his sentence was iniquitous, and therefore 'invalid, and that it left him spiritually unharmed; but he 'was profoundly sensible of other effects.' A Roman Catholic friend, who to a large extent shared his views, said to him—

'Well, at any rate they cannot burn us at the stake.'

'No,' said Döllinger, sternly; 'they cannot burn us at the stake, but they can inflict an amount of moral torture to which the stake would perhaps be preferable.'

To another he said, 'I am the fascine which is flung into 'the ditch to help the others to cross.'

And the stake was not so far off. The penalty which was inflicted on him was the *greater* excommunication, with all the canonical consequences thereto attached. It was, in other words, a sentence of ecclesiastical outlawry, which rendered its victim liable to be struck down by the first fanatic whom the Jesuits could incite to the pious task of ridding the world of the most learned and inflexible of their foes. Döllinger himself pointed out this sinister significance of his sentence, as well as its murderous effect in other cases. It forms an ominous comment on his apprehensions that he actually received from the chief of the police at Munich a warning of intended violence, coupled with the advice never to go out unattended. On the other hand Döllinger had the satisfaction of finding that his repudiation of the Vatican decrees, and consequent excommunication, had the effect of enlisting in his behalf a wholly unexpected amount of sympathy, not only from foreign universities and influential communities, but from individual scholars. The University of Oxford did itself the honour of conferring on him the degree of D.C.L. by diploma on June 6, 1871—only a few

weeks after his excommunication, and other universities and learned bodies bestowed on him similar distinctions. He had the further satisfaction of finding that his resolute stand against Ultramontaniam had not alienated any of his most cherished personal friends. Those who were associated with him in his work at Munich either sympathised with his determination or took part in it.

One consequence of his new position was to draw upon him a number of letters, partly of commendation and encouragement, partly also of pity or of menace and warning. To a lady of rank, who addressed to him more than one appeal of pious but rather maudlin importunity, Döllinger replied in terms so dignified and pathetic as to merit quotation.

'I ought, as the favourite expression of the Jesuits runs, "to make a sacrifice of my intellect" ("sacrificio dell' intelletto"). This is what your Ladyship also demands of me. But if I did so in a question which is, for the historical eye, perfectly clear and unambiguous, then would there no longer be for me any such thing as historical truth and certainty. I should then have to suppose that my whole life long I had been in a world of dizzy illusion, and that in historical matters I am altogether incapable of distinguishing truth from fable and falsehood. The very ground would be thus taken away from under my feet, and that too for my religious views, since even our religion is founded, of course, on historical facts. . . . What would your Ladyship say if you were bidden in the name of the Pope to believe and confess that the existence and the whole history of the first Napoleon was a myth and a fiction? Well, with the same inward certainty with which you are convinced of the existence of Napoleon and of the principal facts of his life, a certainty that no authority in the world can shake, I know that the Vatican decrees are untrue.'

These extracts establish, more clearly and directly than any others which we are able to adduce from his writings, the principle which determined Döllinger to reject the Vatican decrees. He regarded them as an impeachment of his veracity, a direct falsification of his historical conscience. He used to speak of the Council as an all too potent incentive to falsehood and a fruitful lesson in the arts of duplicity and prevarication, remarking that it had produced 'a general *bankruptcy* in morality.' Dr. Plummer, to whom we owe this anecdote, adduces a remarkable conversation he had with Père Hyacinthe on the disingenuousness to which some of the French bishops resorted in order to reconcile what they were pleased to call their conscience to the dogma of Infallibility.

‘Through him I became acquainted with three cases of submission to the dogma :—

‘1. Archbishop Darboy, of Paris, had been one of the most strenuous opponents of the dogma. He was one of the eighty-eight who voted *non placet* at the final division, June 13, 1870, and he was the inspirer, and almost the author, of “*La Dernière Heure du Concile*,” in which it was shown that the Council had been coerced, and that its decrees were forced upon its members. Yet he submitted to them. A few days before his tragical death, in 1871, Père Hyacinthe was with him, and the Archbishop said to him, “*Ce dogme n’a pas l’importance que vous lui attribuez, et au fond il ne décide rien. Je n’y étais pas opposé comme théologien, car il n’est pas faux, mais comme homme, parce qu’il est inepte.*”

This then was one method of submitting. The dogma means nothing. It is silly, but not false. Therefore it may be accepted.

‘2. While I was in Paris in August 1871 I visited Père Gratry, the author of the four famous letters against the definition. He had not yet publicly submitted, but it was certain that the Ultramontane Guibert, the new Archbishop of Paris, would call upon him to submit, and his friends knew that he would comply. Père Gratry deplored the active line taken by Hyacinthe, an activity “*nuisible et stérile.*” He was now quite in the wrong.

“But what Père Hyacinthe has written is not stronger than what you have written.”

“You mean in my letters to the Archbishop of Malines; they were written before the Council.”

“But are they true?”

“Yes, in the main. Some errors of detail there may well be, but the position maintained in them is correct, and I maintain it still. I still hold that the infallibility of the Pope is neither independent (*séparée*) nor personal, nor absolute.”

“That is the very negation of the dogma.”

“Not necessarily. There is a sense in which both may be true, and I find in my conscience that I can accept the dogma and still hold to what I wrote in my letters to the Archbishop of Malines.”

This, therefore, was a second method of submitting. Assert that the dogma means the very opposite of what it plainly states, and then say that you accept it.

‘3. The third instance was that of a priest who visited Hyacinthe at Passy, and told him that he had two convictions—an external and an internal. “With the external I accept the dogma, with the internal I reject it.”

A mode of insincere expression, we may add, which may have been derived from the well-known verse of Euripides—

ἡ γλῶσσ’ ὁμώμοχ’, ἡ δὲ φρεὶν ἀνώμοτος.

At all events it does not rise above it in the scale of morality.

These three methods of guileful assent mentioned by Père Hyacinthe are, however, far from exhausting the catalogue

of similar prevarications and reservations not only sanctioned but recommended by the Jesuits; and the contemplation of hundreds of bishops and priests resorting to such shameful tactics and glorying in them gives a peculiar ethical value to Döllinger's stern refusal to tell a deliberate falsehood *ad maiorem gloriam ecclesiæ*.

Döllinger's breach with the Papacy made no essential difference to his work at Munich. Though he ceased to teach theology he continued to lecture on ecclesiastical history and correlated subjects. In addition to his regular university courses he often lectured on literary and historical topics, not only in Munich, but in other German cities as well. The three volumes of 'Academical Lectures' give us some idea of the range of subjects he thus treated, as well as his masterly mode of handling them. It was only by unintermitting study that he was able to accomplish these occasional labours, which were probably in reference to his ordinary studies mere *πύρεργα*. He had also the habit of keeping a subject for many years before his mind. Thus his last public lecture—that on the Templars—Lord Acton tells us, 'had been always before him since a conversation with Michelet in 1841.' The purely historical theme which largely occupied his declining years was his 'Contributions to the History of the Sects of the Middle Ages,' which he lived just long enough to see published (1889-90). It is a work of enormous research, which cost Döllinger many years of patient labour—not so much in writing as in accumulating the needful materials. He explored, for this purpose, all the chief libraries of Europe, frequently spending the whole of his vacations in examining documents and making extracts. His zeal and success in this department of his labour may be estimated by the fact that the documents and extracts fill a volume of 736 closely printed pages. Another theme on which he expended much thought throughout his life was the Reunion of Christendom, his lectures on which were translated into English in 1872. The book is interesting rather for the reflected light which it throws on the author's mode of thought and his political and religious sympathies than for any practical utility. Döllinger makes the mistake of Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' and all reunion enterprises which have emanated from authors with strong ecclesiastical bias—viz. that of supposing that the great Churches will be content to waive their dogmatic systems in the interest of such a subordinate object as Christian union. At present the chief eccle-

siastical systems of Europe, like its great Powers, are armed and entrenched camps, the serried array of dogmas and prohibitive and exclusive creeds in the one case corresponding with the millions of troops and strong lines of fortifications in the other. Anything like a well-founded peace in either case must be preceded and attended by a general disarmament.

Döllinger's strong interest in this subject, which continued to the close of his life, took the final form of an enquiry as to the true causes of the rupture between the Eastern and Western Churches. It was the last project of his busy life, which unfortunately he did not live to complete. We learn from a communication of Döllinger's publisher, Oscar Beck, that the title of this intended book was 'The Eastern and Western Church - Unity and Disruption.'

The 'Recollections' of Dr. Plummer and the 'Reminiscences' of Madame von Kobell furnish us with a variety of interesting particulars as to Döllinger's personal habits, literary tastes, judgements, and modes of life. Earlier in life, he used to say, he had longed for two things—a country parsonage with a garden and a large library. The first boon was denied him. As to the second, concerning which he was wont to quote Goethe's remark, 'Was man in der Jugend wünscht, hat man im Alter die Fülle,' he said, 'One thing I used to wish for very much, and that I have got, viz. a library.' Showing Mrs. Plummer this gigantic store of 30,000 books, he said in his playful way, 'Not quite all my books are uninteresting. Only an unmarried man could have so many books. A husband would not be allowed to have so many. You see, I am obliged to make use of all available space. That was once a wood closet.' Madame von Kobell tells us that it was not an ornamental but a good working library. The books were stowed often in two, sometimes in three, rows behind each other, the subjects, &c., of the hinder ones being marked by names and indices on paper slips. It is said that Döllinger knew where to put his hand on any book in the back rows of his shelves, though he might not have seen it for many years. During the latter end of his life his household was superintended by his nieces. With a lady's love for such domestic details Madame von Kobell tells us that his servants lived with him for many years. His cook, who had been servant to his parents, continued in his service fifty years, his house-keeper thirty-eight, his general servant thirty-five. This information has, however, another aspect of importance. It

sets in the strongest, though reflected, light the kind, genial, and considerate disposition of their master and friend.

Döllinger's dinners were almost as celebrated as Kant's in the last century. Nothing delighted the old scholar more than to gather round his table a few choice spirits, with whom he conversed with a charming alternation of learning, wit, and deep feeling. In these social reunions Döllinger was probably seen at his best. All his friends agree that, great as he was as a writer, he was still greater as a talker. The perpetual variety, the rapid cut and thrust of intellectual conversation were precisely adapted to call forth his shrewd mother wit, with its occasional veins of keen satire and quaint irony, as well as to exhibit the enormous stores of his learning. His memory must have been phenomenal. His short remarks and longer disquisitions sparkled with quotations, similes, and illustrations from every author of repute, whether of ancient or modern times. Like all genuine students, he was himself exceedingly abstemious, though he took care that his guests were served with the choicest dishes and the most accredited brands of wine. Dr. Plummer informs us:—

‘His abstemiousness was extraordinary. For many years he took only a meal and a half a day, a light breakfast and an early dinner, after which he ate nothing till the next morning. “Of course when I was your age I used to take supper, but now I find I do not require it. Your late dinners do not suit me at all.”’

It was probably a result of his abstemious life that he preserved his vitality and powers of exertion till nearly the close of his life. We are told by Dr. Plummer:—

‘In 1886, when he was eighty-seven, he walked with me one evening for three hours and a quarter without once sitting down. Last year, when he was ninety, he walked with me for nearly an hour in unfavourable weather.’

Notwithstanding his somewhat stormy career, the close of his life was marked by peacefulness and serenity. It was the tranquil sunset of a day whose noontide has been disturbed by the gathering of black menacing clouds, the sullen reverberation of thunder, and the sudden flashing of lightning. We have no reason to suppose, notwithstanding the assertions which Jesuits and Ultramontanes, with their wonted disregard of veracity, have ventured on the subject, that Döllinger ever looked back with regretful affection to the Papacy he had deliberately abandoned—that he ever turned Lot's-wife glances to the Sodom he had once and for

ever quitted. Invitations to do so abounded. The present Pope sent to him more than one message: 'Tell him to come back. There is a new Pope.' 'Yes, but the old Papacy,' was Döllinger's reply. Sixteen years after his breach with Rome, and three only before his death, he received from the Papal Nuncio Ruffo Scilla a private and friendly suggestion of reconciliation, which he answered in a very noteworthy letter, from which we make the following extract:—

'Sixteen years have passed since the anathema was pronounced against me. This time I have employed in devoting myself to renewed study and research, in drawing from the sources, and in following tradition from one century to another. A thorough examination of the alleged testimonies which have been gathered in the works written in favour of the Council has shown me that it is here a question of a mass of alterations, fictions, and forgeries, the greater part of which had been already recognised as such in the seventeenth century.

'And now, reverend sir, what do you require of me? Am I to say to the world, "Catholics and Protestants, behold in me henceforth a man of gross ignorance, who for half a century has been deceiving himself and others, and who has only recognised the truth at the end of his long career"? Would those who are capable of judging in such questions believe me? I know well what they would say. "He has fallen into his dotage;" others, "He is a liar and a vile hypocrite. He must have been one during his whole life, or he is one now." And then my first duty would be to refute myself and my works—works which are translated into several languages—and to show that they are only a tissue of errors. This would indeed be a unique fact, and you would not be able to cite from the whole history of the Church any mental change like it.'

Rarely, if ever, has the utter impossibility to a straightforward mind of a reversion to a discredited and abandoned creed been more forcibly described. In an age and community wherein one moiety of men's lives was often suffered to stand out in palpable refutation of the rest his indignant refusal to turn his back on his conscience was especially significant. However easy the movement of retreat might be to hundreds of other divines and bishops, in Döllinger's case there were evidently *vestigia nulla retrorsum*.

He died calmly, worn out with age and intellectual labour, on January 9, 1890. Just before his death he received the last sacraments of the Church at the hand of Professor Friederich, who had long been his closest friend, his fellow-victim in his excommunication, and his fellow-labourer in much of his intellectual work. He was buried, with every demonstration of public sorrow, on January 16.

His funeral presented a singular spectacle. Around his grave, drawn by the sense of a common bereavement and veneration, stood men of all creeds and of all callings. Among them were Ultramontanes, Old Catholics, Anglicans, Greeks, Lutherans, and various types of Protestants. All rendered a common tribute of reverential affection to the scholar and the Christian, who had evinced by his life how much larger his Christianity was than any single one of its dogmatic types, and how much nearer to his heart were the claims of truth and conscience than the sordid dictates of ecclesiastical interest or worldly ambition.

It only remains to offer a brief summary of his character and work. There is often a curious, though possibly not quite inevitable, connexion between the external life of an eminent man and the psychological formation which is its intellectual and spiritual counterpart. Döllinger's leading characteristic in each was simplicity and directness. Just as his written works display but little evidence of a profound interest or intimate acquaintance with the deeper paths of mental speculation, and as his power of sympathy with alien forms or unusual depths of feeling was limited—not non-existent, as some have maintained—so there is little in his outer life which is not plain to any well-directed observation.

The central point of Döllinger's mind-formation, that around which his character, his interests, and his life alike revolve, is implied in his historical work. He was a born historian. His conception of the universe was almost wholly human, not cosmic. For him the course of human history, with its slow, often complicated and unforeseen unfolding of manifold germs—political, social, and religious—formed the sole object of research, the only worthy form of knowledge attainment. Its presiding Providence might, from the Döllinger standpoint, have reiterated the boast of Goethe's *Erdegeist*—

‘So schaff' ich am sausenden Webstuhl der Zeit
Und wirke der Gottheit lebendiges Kleid,’

evolving in many-coloured texture the seemingly strange and wayward, but really law-ruled, destinies of peoples and institutions, as well as of individuals.

That Döllinger's conception of human history and its countless interests became enlarged with his own mental growth must be admitted. As an Ultramontane he must have shared that narrow conception of man's history and

destiny which makes the developement of dogmatic systems and the maintenance of sacerdotal claims the final cause of human existence. It involved a decided advance, both in profundity and comprehension, when the civil no less than the religious claims of human states and communities assumed for him an independent and substantial interest. We find, indeed, a gradual secularisation in Döllinger's historical standpoint and his conception of human rights which dates from long before his final breach with Rome. Inspired in the first instance by his researches into ecclesiastical history, and his own warm human sympathies, it subsequently manifested itself in modified and enlarged views of the relations of the Church to progressive civilisation and the recognition of popular rights. There was thus a gradual abandonment of the Ultramontane position that the human race was created for the special behoof of the Church, instead of the Church for the advantage of the race, as if the final cause of the universe, with its myriads of stars and planets, was to revolve round the Vatican and St. Peter's at Rome. The change is very distinctly marked in the chronological sequence of his greater historical works, and may even be traced in the succession of his academical lectures. Succinctly it might be defined as the gradual merging of the ecclesiastic into the statesman, the sympathies and interests once mainly confined to the Church expanding themselves till they embraced the civil rights and temporal prosperities of peoples and communities. One result of this healthy growth in political knowledge and secularisation was the substitution of the ethical and practical for the dogmatic and religious interest as the central point of historical inquiry. We seem to detect a diminishing interest in pure speculative dogma and an increased stress on the practical and—we use the word in no invidious or narrow sense—the utilitarian aspects of human belief in his 'History of the Sects of the Middle Ages.' This tendency culminates in his work—to which we have already directed attention—on seventeenth-century ethics, as to which Lord Acton truly says, 'The moral point of view prevails over every other, and conscience usurps the place of theology, canon law, and scholarship. This was his tribute to a new phase of literature' (it was really much more than that, as the final phase of his own historical developement), 'the last he was to see, which was beginning to put ethical knowledge above metaphysics and politics as the central range of human progress. Morality, the

‘proper atmosphere of ideal history, became the paramount interest.’

From the field of human history Döllinger derived his main conception of truth, which always presented itself to him as an historical fact to be discovered by research and verified by evidence. In philosophic or scientific truth, as a relation of congruity between the human mind and the phenomena of nature or the laws of its own being, he had comparatively small interest. Even his conception of Christianity came to him ultimately as a fact of human history rather than as a mysterious satisfaction of *a priori* human needs. In his answer to a lady of rank, from which we have already made extracts, he has some significant words on this point. After saying that our religion is founded, of course, on historical facts, he proceeds:—

‘I must first be convinced that the principal events narrated in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles are essentially true and inviolable, and this conviction must for me, in accordance with my career and profession as teacher, be one which has been ascertained scientifically—i.e. acquired by my own mental endeavours and guaranteed to me by careful investigation.’ *

This conception of history, sacred as well as secular, which does not seem to differ materially from that commonly shared by thoughtful Protestants, furnished Döllinger with his principle of authority as well as with an inexhaustible field for research and induction. We have already admitted—it was no more than a warp or strain of his early Romanist training—that his ratiocination on general subjects of human interest suffered from an ecclesiastical bias. During the earlier half of his life prescription and antiquity, the claims of sacerdotalism and hierarchical autocracy, were for him prepotent sources and vehicles of authority. Re-reading Döllinger’s arguments in reference to the Vatican decrees, the thought has occurred to us, supposing, after all, he had found in some general council or patristic authority an acknowledgement of the Pope’s infallibility, how far would it have modified his attitude towards it? In our humble judgement the infallibility of any human being is as unworthy of serious confutation as the claim which an insane man might make to immunity from physical death.

Döllinger’s survey of ecclesiastical history combined with his careful study of political institutions; their origin, growth, maturity, and perhaps decadence had the effect of

* Declarations and Letters, p. 132.

inducing certain axiomatic principles on those subjects. Thus he held a firm conviction of the fixed, unalterable character of national qualities and its power in evolving and determining national destinies. Lord Acton attributes this belief to the teaching of Moehler and Ganganelli, and as an illustration of it mentions the fact that, in his last letter to Mr. Gladstone, Döllinger 'illustrated the Irish question by means of a chronicle describing Ireland a thousand years ago.'

Both Lord Acton and Dr. Plummer have insisted on one main characteristic of Döllinger's historical labours, viz. that they were undertaken with an absolute freedom from bias of any kind and a want of object. But surely the purpose of Döllinger's historical work is self-evident. It was a resolute and persistent attempt to discover historical truth, to ascertain the facts of the past and to submit them to verification, to eliminate its actual events, records, and personages from the partial or false presentations by which they are so often shrouded and obscured. That he had no theory to govern his research, that he had no object to subserve beyond the discovery of truth, is surely to his credit. Historians, with theories to support and special purposes to serve, are common enough. We may surely be allowed the rare luxury of a Döllinger now and then, who is content with the high if unusual purpose of constituting himself the apostle and high priest of Truth, prepared to serve at her altar and obey her injunctions, and scorning every meaner motive as an insult to her supremacy.

But this very loyalty to truth induced another prominent quality of Döllinger's disposition, viz. his large-hearted toleration. This, it is true, was not an original but a subsequently developed virtue. No characteristic of his later life was more prominent than his compunction for the narrowness and severity of his unregenerate Ultramontane days. He was never tired of expressing his regret for having attacked persons and institutions with which he afterwards came to sympathise, or defending others which maturer thought convinced him were indefensible. He had, e.g., written and spoken of the German reformers with the usual sectarian bitterness of Romish controversialists, but he afterwards expressed his sorrow for the injustice he had done them. His own breach with Rome drew him closer to Luther and Melancthon, and his final estimate of them does not differ materially from that of the average well-informed Protestant. At the same time Döllinger was

never tired of insisting that his errors had been the essential concomitants of his pursuit of truth—that their successive abandonment, like the annual casting of a snake's slough, was a distinct condition and proof of growth. 'My whole life,' he wrote in 1882, 'has been a successive surrendering of errors—of errors which I once held with zeal, opposing them vehemently to the better knowledge gradually dawning upon me—and yet I think I may dare to say that I was not dishonest in so doing.' Sixteen years earlier he wrote (we are indebted to Lord Acton for these quotations): 'It befalls me almost every week that I am compelled to renounce some one error—probably long maintained—that I must even tear it violently out of my mind. Thus one cannot help becoming patient and considerate in the highest degree towards strange errors.'

The unlimited toleration which Döllinger preached he was accustomed to practise. Many striking examples of this are given by his friends. Even his profound disgust with the Vatican decrees could not tempt him to a propaganda on behalf of his own position, or that of his Old Catholic friends. This may be accepted as an illustration of Mr. Gladstone's remark in 1845 that Döllinger 'would answer any objection, but never proselytised.' Dr. Plummer tells us that he was always prepared to excuse even

'those bishops who before and during the Council made use of him to oppose the dogma, and afterwards condemned him for not accepting it. He would point out the terrific oath of subservience to Rome which every bishop in her communion has to take at his consecration, the habit which for generations has been a second nature with them of exhibiting this subservience on all occasions, and the huge difficulties which bishops who refused to submit would have had to confront.'

None of Döllinger's critics have laid the stress which we think it deserves upon his *character* as the true secret of his influence. He started on his career with a mind and intention of which ingenuousness and a growing conviction of the supremacy of truth were constituent elements. He never turned aside from an investigation by apprehension of disagreeable results. 'His critical mind was pliant,' says Lord Acton, 'to assent when he must, to reject when he must, and to doubt when he must.' This is only another mode of stating that the germs and bases of his character and method were primarily intellectual and rational, not sentimental and Pietistic. In contrast with the invertebrate growth and emotional tergiversations of the mere religionist, especially when the Pietistic temperament

is adulterated, as it often is, with hierarchical ambition, the outcome of such a character is not only homogeneous and consistent, but stable and virile. We regard it as a fairly deducible inference from the ascertained facts of Döllinger's character formation up to the time of his breach with the Papacy, that some rupture with its modern spirit and traditions had become inevitable, even if the supremacy of the Jesuits and the infatuation of the Pope and the Roman Curia had not been so conclusively demonstrated by the promulgation of the Vatican decrees.

Much has been spoken and written on Döllinger's final relation to the Papacy which he had quitted, and to the Old Catholic movement which he had helped to form, but of whose Protestant tendencies he did not approve. The question seems to us of easy solution. Döllinger died as he had lived, in full spiritual communion, 1st, with the universal Church catholic as it existed before its Papal deterioration; 2nd, with the larger Church of Christ, which comprehends in its embrace whatever of goodness, unselfishness, and humanity is found in the whole compass of human history. At the same time we feel certain that his own final attitude to religion, as to the general historical work of his life, was a calm, self-concentrated, yet pious individualism. 'Je suis isolé' is an expression which occurs in his letter to the Papal Nuncio, and which we find no difficulty in interpreting in the highest sense of the words that every thoughtful and devout soul finds in the tie that connects it with Deity the cable chain of its ultimate anchorage in time and eternity.

The third chapter of Dr. Plummer's 'Recollections' is devoted altogether to 'English Topics.' He tells us what is perhaps already acknowledged: 'Not many foreigners outside the circle of professional diplomatists have habitually preserved such a keen and well-informed interest in England as Dr. Döllinger.' One of his English centres of interest was his personal friend Mr. Gladstone, whose political measures, however, he criticised with insight and freedom. We again quote Dr. Plummer:—

'The proposal to yield to Mr. Parnell's demand for an Irish Parliament he regarded as disastrous and amazing. He said to me in 1886 that Mr. Gladstone's change of policy seemed to him "one of the most extraordinary delusions ever seen in a statesman. It is so perfectly evident that whatever power is granted to an Irish parliament will be used to make the separation of the countries more complete." He laughed at Manning's heroic audacity in asserting that Roman

Catholics have never persecuted Protestants in the past, and therefore are not likely to do so in the future. "One of the first things that the Irish parliament would do would be to take possession of Trinity College, Dublin, and turn it into a Roman Catholic university."

'Dr. Döllinger considered that one of the main sources of the strength of the English Church was the fact that on the whole clergy and laity have the same education. He was entirely opposed to the system of seminaries—i.e. separate schools and colleges for those who are destined for holy orders.'

Although full of sympathy for the High Church and historical school in the Church of England, Dr. Döllinger had no admiration for ritualism.

'What an extraordinary thing that is, that enthusiasm about vestments, which makes men fanatical about a chasuble! It is a condition of things which you would find in no other country. And about a chasuble of all vestments, which is certainly neither graceful nor convenient. . . . An English clergyman once called on me who evidently thought that I should be very pleased to know that, in celebrating the Eucharist, he wore vestments closely resembling those of our own clergy. And some time afterwards I received a photograph of him in this costume—biretta, chasuble, lace, and all the rest of it. It amused me much, and, I confess, rather disgusted me—firstly, that he should care to be photographed in such attire; and, secondly, that he should suppose that I should care to have the photograph.'

'On the question of the Burials Bill he was much surprised that any English Churchman, and especially those of our own clergy, should object to being freed from the obligation of burying Dissenters at the cost of admitting Dissenting ministers to the churchyards. . . .'

On another 'burning question' he took a somewhat similar view, viz. that of the Athanasian Creed. In Germany such a commotion as we had had in England about the use or disuse of the Creed would be, he said, scarcely possible.

'Few people here would insist upon rigid agreement with formulas in a matter of such inscrutable mystery as the Trinity. In some particulars it is impossible to know the meaning of the terms used. The most subtle philosopher and the most profound theologian cannot explain the difference between "generation" and "procession" in the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit. . . . The Reformers made a great mistake in putting the Creed in the public service. It should never have been placed there.'

But we have exhausted our space, and must conclude. Though only a comparatively short time has elapsed since Döllinger's death, there can be no difficulty in determining the nature and degree of fame he is destined to retain in the future. In many respects his position and character, as

well as his opportunities and surroundings, were unique. He stands forth as the one *man* among the human simulacra—the changeful, shadowy chameleons which crowd the pontificate of Pius IX. and cover the Vatican Council with indelible contempt. Apart from his literary fame and his many invaluable contributions to Church history, the masterful personality of the man is his most distinguishing characteristic. It is Döllinger's undying merit to have stood forth—eventually single-handed and alone—against the most astounding infatuation in which any religious community in civilised times has ever indulged; to have vindicated the inviolable rights of reason and conscience against the most undisguised attack ever made upon them; to have asserted the claims of Catholicism in its most defensible form against the injurious perversions of unscrupulous and immoral factions. This is Döllinger's claim on the gratitude and renown of future ages.

We have every confidence that the gratitude will be forthcoming, and the renown conceded. As long as a strong virile morality is esteemed of higher worth than a flaccid and decrepit Pietism, as long as duty is preferred to selfish interest, as long as genuine Christianity maintains its supremacy above its ecclesiastical corruptions and deteriorations, as long as a life of simple earnest laboriousness for the instruction of men and the diffusion of truth and charity is regarded as the noblest of human careers—so long will Ignatius von Döllinger occupy a high place in the bede-roll of the most illustrious names of the present century.

ART. IV.—*The Elements of Politics.* By HENRY SIDGWICK, Author of 'The Methods of Ethics,' and 'The Principles of Political Economy.' London: 1891.

IN this comprehensive work Professor Sidgwick has travelled over a wide field. He has undertaken to expound the whole theory of politics, and to describe the proper functions and structure of governments. In the first part, which extends over 300 closely printed pages, he has analysed the principles on which legislation should be based in a well-ordered community, and which should regulate the relations of a State with Foreign Powers. In the second part, which is of almost equal length, he has described the methods and instruments of government in a civilised country; has detailed the duties which attach to the legislature, the executive, and the judicature respectively; has considered how these bodies should be constituted or composed, and the manner in which they should be dependent on, or independent of, one another. To the task which he has thus imposed on himself he has brought industry, care, and acuteness; and he has, in consequence, produced a work which, whether we agree with it or not, is well worth reading by everyone interested in 'the elements of politics.'

Before attempting, however, to follow Professor Sidgwick in his exhaustive inquiry, we must discharge the duties of a reviewer by making a few observations both on his matter and on his manner. And, in the first place, we must frankly confess that we regard his method with some distrust. He has discarded almost throughout his work the teachings of experience, and has founded his theory of politics on reasoning which is mainly or purely deductive. In his own language:—

'In framing the precepts or maxims of practical politics, induction from the political experiences which history records can only be employed in a secondary way, as a useful and important, though necessarily imperfect, test of the results otherwise obtained. But, if this be so, by what other rational method can we deal with the questions of practical politics? According to my view, it must be a method mainly deductive: we must assume certain general characteristics of man and his circumstances—characteristics belonging not to mankind universally, but to civilised man in the most advanced stages of his development; and we must consider what laws and institutions are likely to conduce most to the wellbeing of an aggregate of such beings living in social relations.'

But the writer who deliberately makes such a choice

discards, or at any rate subordinates, the material of most importance of any at his disposal. For in politics, as in everything else, experience is our safest guide. It helps us to solve the problems of the present by examining the history of the past; and, if we deliberately close our eyes to its lessons, or regard them as of inferior significance, we are in constant danger of falling into errors from which a careful retrospective survey may usually save us.

Moreover, we are not sure that Professor Sidgwick can claim that he has adopted the deductive method. 'The deductive inquirer,' in Buckle's well-known language, 'assumes certain principles as original, and reasons from them to the facts which actually appear in the world.' But in much of Professor Sidgwick's book we can trace no such process. Instead of a careful deduction from the principles, we are constantly confronted with the writer's own opinion. We are continually meeting with such sentences as 'I am inclined to think,' or 'I am of opinion.' We freely admit that, before delivering his judgement on any matter, Professor Sidgwick is careful to explain the arguments on each side of the case with a fulness that reminds us of Mr. Sydney Buxton's political handbooks; and that his conclusion, when finally pronounced, is always that of a clear, impartial, and painstaking thinker. But in a book of this character we want something more than the opinion of the author on a controverted question. The mind requires to be convinced either by induction founded on experience or by clear deductive reasoning; and in many instances it fails to derive conviction from Professor Sidgwick's pages.

In the next place, we think we notice throughout the first part of Professor Sidgwick's book that his opinions have been insensibly moulded by the state of legislation and thought in England at the present time. He is ready to travel at least as far as Parliament has already advanced, but he is not prepared, 'except under specially favourable conditions,' to go any further 'at the present time or in the proximate future.' Thus, to take some typical examples, he is not willing to limit the right of bequest except by imposing 'a tax on inheritance, considerably increased when bequests are received by others than near relations;' he is not willing to prevent an unqualified medical practitioner from practising, but he is prepared to say that he should not be entitled to recover his fees; he is not willing to embark on any redistribution of property, but he is prepared to 'compensate' the unpropertied classes for the loss of the opportunities which

‘the propertied classes are in the position of diminishing’ by well-directed outlay ‘tending either to increase the efficiency and mobility of labour, or to bring within the reach of all members of a civilised society some share of the culture which we agree in regarding as the most valuable result of civilisation.’ In these and other matters Professor Sidgwick seems to have formed his opinions, not by any process of deductive reasoning, but by a study of the latest volumes of the statute book, or the more recent parliamentary debates. The first part of his volume, in fact—if we may say so without disrespect—comprises a *catalogue raisonné* of the most recent improvements in legislation. We cannot, however, imagine that legislation has said its last word on the great social problems which are perplexing mankind. The solution of them which finds favour to-day differs from that which was accepted by our fathers, and may be superseded by the remedy which will be applied by our children; and the writer who is only in line with his contemporaries may not improbably find himself in the rear of the succeeding generation.

In the third place, we think that Professor Sidgwick has laid inadequate stress on the relations of morality to law and to government. We are not now using the word ‘morality’ in the technical sense in which jurists of the school of Austin employ it. We have no occasion at this moment to draw a distinction between what such writers call positive law and positive morality. We are simply alluding to the influence which the moral code exercises on the conduct of every people. In saying, however, that Professor Sidgwick has not laid sufficient stress on morals, we do not wish to be misunderstood. It was, perhaps, open to a writer to exclude questions of morality altogether from a purely technical treatise on the Elements of Politics. That is the course which was practically adopted by Adam Smith in the ‘Wealth of Nations.’ He assumed, for his immediate purpose, that man was a selfish animal, as a general rule actuated in the affairs of life by selfish motives; and he dealt, in another and separate work, ‘The Theory of Moral Sentiments,’ with the finer qualities of sympathy and benevolence by which the conduct of the best men in all ages has been influenced. It was open to Professor Sidgwick to follow this great example. For the purpose of a scientific treatise he might have assumed that men, as a general rule, were occupied in promoting their own interests; and that society, in accordance with this rule, was bound to aim at

securing the greatest happiness of the greatest number. But this is not the course which Professor Sidgwick has taken. In his thirteenth chapter he has recognised the importance of morality in domestic legislation; in his seventeenth chapter he has considered the influence which morality ought to exercise on international questions. But, though he has thus admitted the moral code within the limits of his treatise, he has endeavoured to solve many problems on utilitarian principles, which, it seems to us, morality must solve in defiance of utility; while he has ignored other questions which claimed his consideration, and which are among the most difficult for either the moralist or the statesman to answer. Take, for example, the question of free immigration into a populous country like our own. Is it right or is it desirable to place any restriction on the immigration of pauper aliens? Professor Sidgwick tells us first that

‘Freedom of immigration . . . seems to be implicitly assumed in the most general economic argument for free trade: since, in order that the advantages of complete freedom of exchange may be fully realised, it is necessary that labour should move with perfect ease from country to country to meet the changes that are continually likely to occur in the industrial demand for it.’

A sentiment which may be true enough in a general way, but which has nothing to do with the immigration (say) of poor Russian Jews into the East End of London. The Professor, therefore, goes on:—

‘The truth is that when we consider how far the exercise of this right of exclusion is conducive to the real interest of the State exercising it, or of humanity at large, we come upon the most striking phase of the general conflict between the cosmopolitan and the national ideals of political organisation. . . . According to the national ideal, the right and duty of each government is to promote the interests of a determinate group of human beings, bound together by the tie of a common nationality . . . and to consider the expediency of admitting foreigners . . . solely from this point of view. According to the cosmopolitan ideal, its business is to maintain order over the particular territory that historical causes have appropriated to it, but not in any way to determine who is to inhabit the territory, or to restrict the enjoyment of its natural advantages to any particular portion of the human race. The latter is perhaps the ideal of the future; but at present I must discard it, as allowing too little for the national and patriotic sentiments which have in any case to be reckoned with as an actually powerful political force, and which I regard as, for several reasons, at present indispensable to social wellbeing.’

According, then, to Professor Sidgwick, the right of

excluding aliens depends on the definition to be applied to Bentham's greatest happiness of the greatest number. If we take the cosmopolitan definition, 'the ideal of the future,' and mean by greatest number the greatest number of people in the world, we must admit aliens. But, if we take the national definition, and confine the term to the greatest number of people living in a particular country, we shall be justified in excluding them. Professor Sidgwick takes the latter definition and, consequently, arrives at the characteristically cautious conclusion that

'it would be a proper policy to place restrictions on immigration if ever it should threaten to take such dimensions as to interfere materially with the internal cohesion of a nation, or with the efforts of government to maintain an adequately high standard of life among the members of the community generally, especially the poorer classes.'

Will anyone be satisfied with such a conclusion formed on such grounds? Nations, like men, have duties thrown upon them which cannot be solely decided by considerations of utility. And if on such grounds alone we are to refuse the hospitality of the nation to the outcast and the miserable, we should ourselves desire to revert to the moral code which Homer, nearly three thousand years ago, put into the mouths of Nausicaa and Eumæus:—

Ἄλλ' ὅδε τις δύστηνος ἀλώμενος ἐθάδ' ἱκάνει,
Τὸν νῦν χρὴ κομέειν· πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἶσιν ἄπαιτες
Ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε· δούσις δ' ὀλίγη τε, φίλη τε.—

or, if we may add Pope's inadequate translation:—

'Tis ours this son of sorrow to relieve,
Cheer the sad heart, nor let affliction grieve.
By Jove the stranger and the poor are sent,
And what to those we give to Jove is lent.'

If, however, there is one class of questions, such as that involved in the admission of aliens, or—to take another prominent example—in the treatment of the insane, which cannot be decided on utilitarian principles alone, there is another class of questions with which every dominant race, like the English, is confronted, and which Professor Sidgwick fails to notice. For every country which has extended its sway over other nations is certain to discover that the moral code, which its foremost men have established at home, differs from, and is perhaps superior to, the moral code which prevails in its dependencies. And there is no more difficult or delicate matter for statesmen to determine than the propriety of enforcing their own ideas on a subject people to

whom they are probably distasteful. During the present century such questions have constantly occupied the attention of the men who have been responsible for the government of India. The existence of Suttee, the exposure of female infants, and, more recently, the prevalence of child marriages, are only prominent examples of the subjects to which we are referring. Is it the business of the dominant race in such matters to force its own ideas on a subject people at the risk of provoking discontent and, possibly, revolt? Or should it be its duty to convert, in the first instance, a dependent population to its own views, and thus prepare the way for the establishment of a higher morality? So far as we are able to judge, the compromise on these questions at which the foremost Indian administrators have arrived is the best which is attainable. They have refrained from thrusting their own moral code on a people to whom it would have been unintelligible. But they have seized every practical opportunity for repressing customs which are either cruel or immoral. Thus a favourable occasion was taken by a previous generation for the abolition of Suttee: and thus in our own time the age of marriage has been definitely raised. But these problems have been dealt with on moral and not on utilitarian principles; and utility alone, if no other guide had been forthcoming, would not have helped us to their solution.

We have discharged a critic's duty in pointing out some defects in Professor Sidgwick's work, and we now gladly turn to an analysis of its contents. The Professor starts from the broad principle that 'the ultimate criterion of the goodness of law, and of the actions of government generally, is their tendency to increase the general happiness.' But he enlarges the term 'general happiness' to include 'not only the human beings who are actually living [in a community], but those who are to live hereafter.' It seems, indeed, from a passage in one of his latest chapters, which we have already quoted, that he has some doubt whether the definition should not be still further extended, and 'the greatest number' should not include all the people living in the world. For the purposes of practical politics, however, the simple rule which Bentham laid down seems sufficiently broad; and legislators may usually be satisfied if the laws, which it is their business to frame, secure the happiness of those in whose interests they are made. Happiness may be promoted in two ways: (1) 'The government may aim at making each of the individuals to whom its commands are

'addressed promote his own happiness better than he would 'without interference'—in other words, it may embark on 'what is commonly called paternal legislation ; or (2) it 'may 'aim at making [the individual's] conduct more conducive to 'the happiness of others,' or, in simple language, it may prevent one person from injuring or annoying another. The objections to the first course are founded on the broad principle that men, as a general rule, are the best judges of their own individual interests, and that any interference with them is likely to be not only annoying but mischievous ; and though the principle—as will be shown later on—cannot be universally applied, governments should, as a general rule, confine themselves to the second of the two courses, and restrict their action to compelling one individual to render to another such services as he may either be legally bound, or he may have agreed, to discharge ; and to restraining him from doing any act which may be mischievous or irritating to any other person. As legislation of this kind leaves the individual liberty for himself, and affords him protection against his neighbour, it is usually known as 'Individualism,' or, to take the French term, *laissez faire*. When individualistic principles are applied as strictly as possible, we arrive at the minimum of governmental interference, which Professor Sidgwick calls 'the individualistic 'minimum.'

But, however strong our desire may be to limit the interference of government in the ordinary affairs of life, there are three matters in which such interference is inevitable. The first concerns contracts ; the second, property ; the third, the personal safety of each member of the community.

On the first of these subjects Professor Sidgwick has little that is new to tell us. He sees clearly enough that the liberty to enter into contracts or agreements is one of the most important rights that are secured to the citizen ; and that the right is deprived of its value if the contract cannot be enforced.

'Withdraw contract—suppose that no one can count upon anyone else fulfilling an engagement—and the members of a human community are atoms that cannot effectively combine ; the complex co-operation and division of employments that are the essential characteristics of modern industry cannot be introduced.'

Thus the enforcement of contracts is fundamentally important in an individualistic system ; and legal validity should be given to all agreements—'(1) deliberately made between 'persons possessing at the time mature reason, if they have

'been made without (2) coercion, or (3) wilful or careless 'misrepresentation on either side; and (4) if the effects 'they were designed to produce involve (a) no violation of 'law, or (b) no cognisable injury to the community.' These exceptions are, of course, already well known to the law courts, and do not seem to require detailed examination. But it is interesting to observe that Professor Sidgwick does not consider that, on individualistic principles, there is any justification for setting aside a contract in which one man gains by the distress of another. In other words, if we may illustrate his general conclusion by a particular example, individualistic principles would not justify the State in cancelling the lease of a farm, for which the landlord had been able to exact an excessive rent from the inability of the tenant to live without land, or to obtain other land than that which he was hiring from the owner. In such a case, though the tenant has made an unfavourable bargain, which 'in popular political discussion is sometimes said not 'to be free,' interference, in Professor Sidgwick's judgement, is unjustifiable on the strict principles of individualism.

So far we have been considering the case of contracts intended to have an immediate effect. In prospective agreements, the State should not enforce the contract, but exact adequate compensation for its non-fulfilment. For

'the performance of a compact may become, through change of circumstances, indefinitely more inconvenient to the promiser than it is advantageous to the promisee. Supposo I undertake to sweep a man's chimneys for a year, and to-morrow a rich uncle dies and leaves me a million; there would be an obvious balance to unhappiness in holding me to my contract. What is important, from our present point of view, is, not that promises should be kept, but that the recipients of promises should not suffer from their breach.'

The second question on which the strict individualist permits the interference of government relates to property. The idea of property, according to Professor Sidgwick, is inseparably connected with the right of exclusive use. It implies the right of alienation, and, though this perhaps stands on a different footing, the right of bequest. Property does not merely include material things, such as land, houses, clothes, and food; it extends to the 'rights to non-imitation, by 'which the results of intellectual labour are protected, whether 'these results are of the nature of technical invention secured 'by patent, or literary products secured by copyright.' But the most difficult, and at any rate the most burning, questions in reference to property are connected with property in land,

Professor Sidgwick sees that 'it is for the general good' that the individual cultivator's energy and enterprise should 'be encouraged as much as possible, and that complete ownership is the most simple and effective way of encouraging it.' But he is also impressed with the fact that the possession of land by the landowners diminishes the opportunities of those who have no land, or, as he puts it, 'private property in land involves a substantial encroachment on the opportunities of applying labour productively which, were it not for such appropriation, would be open to individuals now landless.' And he consequently arrives at the conclusion that some compensation is due from those who hold real property to those who do not. In the case of a new country, where land is in course of settlement, Professor Sidgwick thinks that this compensation might be found by selling the land to the highest bidder, and investing the proceeds for the benefit of the community. But, unless he intends to except the landlords from the community, it is obvious that this suggestion will not effect his object. For the landlords will plainly derive as much benefit, and from their position will probably secure a greater benefit, from such investment than any other class. In the case of an old country he apparently thinks that the State might resume possession of the soil at some distant date, compensating, we presume, the existing proprietors, since he proposes that the date of resumption should be made a distant one, to diminish the difficulty of compensation.

But we fail to see how this process would secure the result at which he is apparently aiming. In a populous country like England no conceivable distribution of the land can ensure a share of it to every family in the State; and, if the State be made the sole proprietor, the occupiers will be at the mercy of one great landlord, instead of being able to arrange terms with a number of large and small landlords. We are not, moreover, sure that we draw the same conclusion as Professor Sidgwick from the circumstance that 'private property in land involves a substantial encroachment on the opportunities of applying labour productively which, were it not for such appropriation, would be open to individuals now landless.' If this thesis is true at all, is it not true of other things besides land? Test it by another example. Private property in sewing machines involves a substantial encroachment on the opportunities of applying labour productively which, were it not for such appropriation, would be open to seamstresses without machines.

What then? Are we to allow the possession of sewing machines, but to devise some form of compensation for all the young women who have not succeeded in buying them? When once, in fact, we commence an attack upon one kind of property, we find ourselves logically compelled to press on beyond the goal which was our original object; and modern Socialists are more consistent than Professor Sidgwick in desiring to terminate not merely property in land, but all kinds of property.

Loose and inexact conclusions are so undesirable on a subject on which a good deal of inaccurate writing is constantly expended, that it may not be undesirable to contrast Professor Sidgwick's opinion with that of a writer to whose authority he will defer.

'Want and labour,' wrote Austin, 'spring from the niggardliness of nature, and not from the inequality which is consequent on the institution of property. These evils are inseparable from the condition of man upon earth; and are lightened, not aggravated, by this useful, though invidious, institution. Without capital, and the arts which depend upon capital, the reward of labour would be far scantier than it is; and capital, with the arts which depend upon it, are creatures of the institution of property. The institution is good for the many, as well as for the few. The poor are not stripped by it of the produce of their labour; but it gives them a part in the enjoyment of wealth which it calls into being. In effect, though not in law, the labourers are co-proprietors with the capitalists who hire their labour. The reward which they get from their labour is principally drawn from capital; and they are not less interested than the legal owners in protecting the fund from invasion.'

We think it would be hardly possible to cite any passage in the language which explains the advantages of property more concisely or more clearly than this extract from the 'Province of Jurisprudence.' But, though the exclusive use of property can be defended by arguments which appear to us unassailable, and is not obnoxious to the charge, which Professor Sidgwick brings against it, of involving a substantial encroachment on the opportunities of applying labour productively, we do not forget that the title to a man's estate rests upon law, and that the law which regulates its possession, its alienation, and its devolution is as liable to alteration as any other law. We agree, too, with Professor Sidgwick that in some respects the law is a relic of past custom, and might be altered with general advantage. For instance, the law which regulates the succession to real estate in case of intestacy is the relic of that old feudal system which parcelled out the land of the community

among the dependants of the lord, and required that a man should always be available for every parcel. In the existing state of society there does not seem to be any reason why the law should determine the succession to the real estate of an intestate in one manner and distribute his personalty in another; and Professor Sidgwick is probably right in concluding that, as 'the persons who have land to leave by will, 'and who wish to make "an eldest son," are an insignificantly 'small minority,' there would be a balance of convenience in its alteration. The regulation of intestate estates is, however, after all a matter of minor importance, since the great majority of persons who have money to leave take the precaution of making a will. Perfect freedom of bequest has a much later origin than most persons probably imagine. It was not known in old Rome during a considerable portion of her history. It was limited in mediæval law by the rights of the testator's widow and children, and the power of distributing property capriciously is not older than the later portion of the Middle Ages. It has in modern times been sanctioned by the consciousness that a rich man is likely to dispose of his wealth more sensibly than any public authority, and by the belief that liberty to bequeath is a strong motive to acquire. Professor Sidgwick is disposed to reject the counsels of extreme men, and to defend freedom of bequest as an inducement to thrift. 'Probably,' so he writes, 'all that can be safely attempted in the way 'of limiting bequests in the interests of the community is a 'tax on inheritance, considerably increased when bequests 'are received by other than near relations.' According to this view, the last word on the subject was apparently spoken when Mr. Gladstone imposed a graduated legacy duty in 1853. But some of Professor Sidgwick's readers will, we imagine, be disinclined to halt permanently at this resting-place. Many politicians, unprepared to concur in the extreme programme of the Socialists, are ready to accept a legacy duty, graduated not by the kinship of the legatee to the legator, but according to the amount of the legacy. The present Government has given expression to this feeling by imposing an additional duty on large estates. We should have been glad to discover the opinion of an impartial inquirer like Professor Sidgwick on this subject, and to learn whether in his judgement Mr. Goschen's policy was justifiable on individualistic principles.

The third subject, on which the interference of government may be justified on the principles of individualism, is con-

cerned with the reparation of wrong and the punishment of evil-doing. There is an obvious distinction between 'the kind of wrongs for which the enforcement of damages is the appropriate penalty [and] the kind of wrongs for which punishment proper is required.' The difference between a criminal prosecution and a civil action is plain to everyone. Professor Sidgwick, indeed, holds that this distinction, 'though very important, is not so fundamental as it is commonly conceived to be, because both in determining when damages are due, and when punishment should be inflicted, for past mischief, the prevention of future mischief ought generally to be a paramount consideration.' But, on the other hand, he does not wish to underrate

'the practical importance of the distinction between punishment and damages, as appropriate respectively to crimes and civil injuries. A clear distinction between the procedures belonging to the two kinds of remedies respectively is a necessary element of a civilised system of law. For, where it is an adequate means of preventing wrongs to fix the burden of reparation on the wrongdoer, there is no absolute necessity for any intervention of government: the required reparation may as well be made privately between the parties, so that it may properly be left to the option of the individual wronged to invoke the aid of government if necessary. On the other hand, where punishment, as distinct from reparation, is needed in the interest of the community at large, it must be the business of government to secure that it shall be inflicted whenever it is deserved; to secure, therefore, that persons harmed by the crime shall come forward and give evidence, and shall not make peace with the criminal. And to attain this result, it is found more and more necessary, as civilisation advances, that government should make the prosecution of crimes its own business.'

Thus individualism, in Professor Sidgwick's hands, sanctions the enforcement of contracts, the maintenance of property, the prevention of wrongdoing, and even leads to the appointment of a public prosecutor. Individualism alone, however, cannot satisfy the complex requirements of a civilised community. In advanced stages of society proof is continually forthcoming that the individual, dependent upon his unaided resources, is frequently no match for his fellow-men, and that the State must consequently interfere for his protection. Labourers in want of work, for instance, cannot be expected to insist that the dangers, inseparable from some occupations, should be minimised by the fencing of machinery, the regulation of factories, the inspection of mines, and the supervision of trading vessels; and individualists must consequently make up their minds to legislate on

these matters, or to contemplate a large measure of avoidable suffering and mortality. In modern societies, moreover, many things are possible to the community as a whole which are impossible to the individual member of it. It would be a hopeless task to rely on individual effort to drain, or even light, a city. It is the function of the governing body, which we call the municipality, to undertake, in the common interest, the work which the individual citizen cannot perform alone. Thus we are continually confronted with the necessity for legislation, which individualistic principles cannot sanction, but which is justified because it is intended to promote the general happiness. When such legislation is designed to protect one man against another—whether it be tenant against landlord, workman against employer, or consumer against tradesman—it is called paternal; when it is proposed to enable the community, as a whole, to do what its individual members cannot do separately, it is called socialistic.

In the chapter in which Professor Sidgwick has discussed these two problems he has endeavoured to show that paternal legislation is frequently justifiable on the principle of individualism. Thus he writes: 'No individualist objects to coercion exercised on children in their own interest; nor can it be maintained that the interests of children can safely be left altogether to their parents. . . . Interference with the labour of women during childbearing is theoretically defensible on similar grounds, as an indirect protection of the physical wellbeing of children.'

Deductive reasoning then apparently leads Professor Sidgwick to the conclusion that the principle of *laissez faire* or individualism is only applicable to adult males, and cannot be extended to their children, or, in all cases, to their wives. But even in the case of the adult male the principle occasionally breaks down. Take, for instance, the case of insanitary dwellings. Professor Sidgwick, indeed, argues that the main justification of prohibiting the use of a house unfit for human habitation, or overcrowding, 'lies in the need of protecting children and other adults who might suffer if [the] house became a focus of disease.' And he pushes this reasoning still further in justification of legislation of a similar character:—

'For instance, when our Government endeavours to prevent its subjects from employing improperly qualified physicians, apothecaries, and pilots; or from buying meat known to be diseased; or from taking part in dangerous industrial processes—as (e.g.) mining and navigation—

it may be said that it aims merely at protecting its subjects from evils incurred through ignorance of which other persons take advantage; and thus there is a legitimate extension of the protection against deception which individualists have always regarded as being within the limits of their fundamental rule. . . . The truth is, that it is a task of much delicacy to define the individualistic principle, in relation to deception, with the exactness required for practical application. When it is affirmed that an "individual should be left to take care of his own interests," some proviso is always understood with regard to his protection against imposture; but the precise nature of the proviso is left somewhat obscure; and it may be plausibly extended to prohibit any man from knowingly profiting by the ignorance of another.

If it pleases the advocates of individualism to justify paternal legislation by such reasoning, there can be no possible objection to their doing so. But, for our own part, we think it much simpler to acknowledge that the maxim *laissez faire*, though it contains a truth of great value, does not contain the whole truth. It seems to us idle to pretend, for example, that interference with a man's discretion as to the room which he shall occupy can be reconciled with the principle that, as the individual is the best judge of his own interests, he shall be left to make his own arrangements as to his home. The principle of *laissez faire* in such a case gives way, because in the interests of the community it is expedient that it should do so. Legislation, in fact, is governed by expediency; it is guided by a desire to promote the general good, or, in Bentham's phrase, to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number, because it is expedient to promote these objects. But, while we are ready to admit that the greatest happiness will usually be promoted by allowing the individual perfect liberty of action, we are not prepared to agree with Mill that 'each person is the only safe guardian of his own rights and interests,' and to condemn the whole of the paternal legislation which is opposed to this contention.

In modern society, however, paternal legislation is usually accompanied with what Professor Sidgwick calls socialistic legislation. And here we require to define the meaning of our words before we can hope to make much progress. For, unfortunately, there are two kinds of legislation, both of which are known as socialistic, but which differ widely from each other both in their objects and their consequences. In one sense of the term Socialism is a cause which most men are agreed in promoting. For it aims at enabling the community as a whole to carry out designs which the individuals

composing it, acting separately, would be powerless to accomplish. The Post Office furnishes the chief example of this kind of socialism, while the provision of free schools is its latest, and perhaps most remarkable, development. But there is another sense in which the word 'socialism' is commonly used. It is applied to the policy of those who desire to diminish

'the marked inequalities in income which form so striking a feature of modern civilised societies. . . . Accordingly, a main aim of current Socialism in its extremest form—we may distinguish it as Collectivism—is to substitute common for private ownership, and governmental for private management of the instruments of production in all important departments of industry: so that the payment of interest on industrial capital may cease and labour receive its full reward.'

Professor Sidgwick is opposed to the realisation of this idea; and, holding this opinion, he does not think that 'a discussion of collectivism or socialism in an extreme form falls properly within the scope of [his] treatise.' The student of elementary politics who turns from the heresies of the Fabian essays to the more orthodox pages of Professor Sidgwick will consequently only find the baldest and most unsatisfactory discussion upon it. The name, indeed, which Professor Sidgwick suggests—or rather, adopts—for the extremest form of socialism is singularly inadequate. For the term 'collectivism' seems to cover that part of socialism which is the least objectionable. It implies the collective or united action of society for certain objects, but it does not point to the annihilation of individual rights and rewards which appears to be the necessary consequence of the destruction of property and capital. Instead, then, of the terms which find favour with Professor Sidgwick, we should much prefer to call that form of socialism which arms the state or the municipality with power to discharge certain duties for the community, *enabling socialism*; while that other kind of socialism which aims at the destruction of property might be styled, with equal fitness, *disabling socialism*.

We hope that Professor Sidgwick may be right in thinking that this kind of socialism may not be within the range of practical politics; but it is impossible to ignore the fact that it enters into and influences current political discussion. Men of ability are demanding the intervention of the State in commercial undertakings, not merely for the sake of making their management more efficient or more economical,

but for the purpose of destroying the individual capitalist. Yet surely no wilder object has ever been promoted by reasonable men. The great improvement which the last half-century has witnessed in the condition of the industrial classes has been mainly effected by the aid of capital; and, if we extinguish capital, we extinguish the means which have been hitherto potent for good. As Austin wrote:—

‘Without security for property, there were no inducement to save. Without habitual saving on the part of proprietors, there were no accumulation of capital. Without accumulation of capital, there were no fund for the payment of wages, no division of labour, no elaborate and costly machines; there were none of those helps to labour which augment its productive powers, and, therefore, multiply the enjoyments of every individual in the community. Frequent invasions of property would bring the rich to poverty; and, what were a greater evil, would aggravate the poverty of the poor.’

We have seen that, in dealing with internal politics, Professor Sidgwick has had occasionally to strain his principles in order to reconcile the paternal and socialistic legislation of the present day with the individualistic doctrine on which his whole treatise is based. In his chapter on external politics he has encountered still greater difficulty; and, in attempting to introduce the rules of Bentham and Mill into the Foreign Office, he has, we think, involved himself in some confusion.

According to Professor Sidgwick, in foreign as in domestic politics, it should be the object of statesmen to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number, and the greatest happiness will usually be obtained by a system of *laissez faire*, or, in diplomatic language, non-intervention. But in this contention Professor Sidgwick has purposely disregarded the main consideration by which statesmen have hitherto been guided. He has, in other words, refused to admit that the interests of a nation should regulate its policy. Thus he writes:—

‘The ultimate end and standard of right international conduct [is] the general happiness of all the human beings concerned, and not merely the interests of one particular State.’

And again more fully:—

‘The most fundamental question is whether a government should take as the ultimate end and criterion of right conduct, in dealing with individuals and communities outside it, the interest or happiness of all the persons concerned, or merely the interest of the particular group which it governs and represents, and their posterity.’

not prepared to maintain that the two criteria will always practically coincide; and, in case of conflict, I cannot hesitate to prefer the former; to prefer the latter would appear to me deliberate immorality.'

The conclusion is so strongly expressed, and is at the same time, as we believe, so unsound, that we propose to test it first by authority and next by experience. With the first object we will again contrast the conclusion of Austin with that of Professor Sidgwick:—

'The principle of general utility [wrote Austin] imperiously demands that [the individual] commonly shall attend to his own rather than to the interests of others; that he shall not habitually neglect that which he knows accurately in order that he may habitually pursue that which he knows imperfectly. . . .

'Even where utility requires that benevolence shall be our motive, it commonly requires that we shall be determined by partial rather than by general benevolence; by the love of the narrower circle which is formed of family or relations, rather than by sympathy with the wider circle which is formed of friends or acquaintance; by sympathy with friends or acquaintance rather than by patriotism; by patriotism or love of country rather than by the larger humanity which embraces mankind.'

'In short, the principle of utility requires that we shall act with the utmost effect, or that we shall so act as to produce the utmost good. And (speaking generally) we act with the utmost effect, or we so act as to produce the utmost good, when our motive or inducement to conduct is the most urgent and steady, when the sphere wherein we act is the most restricted and the most familiar to us, and when the purpose which we directly pursue is the most determinate or precise.'

So far, then, from it being immoral to prefer the interests of country to the interests of mankind, the high authority of Austin may be cited to show that utility requires that our conduct shall be determined 'by patriotism, rather than by the larger humanity which embraces mankind.' And experience is in favour of Austin and not of Professor Sidgwick. Test Professor Sidgwick's conclusion by applying it to any question of practical politics, such, for instance, as is raised by the opening or closing of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles to ships of war. The interest or happiness of all the persons concerned does not coincide with the interest or happiness of the particular group which is represented by her Majesty's Government. For the interests of Russia are plainly concerned in securing an access for her ships of war to the sea; and the interests of this country might conceivably be endangered by the junction of the Russian and French fleets in the Mediterranean. Does Professor Sidgwick really mean that, in dealing with this subject, Lord Salisbury should

give equal weight to the interests of Russia and to those of his own country? Does he really consider that it would be 'deliberate immorality' on his Lordship's part to resist the demand of Russia because the interests of Britain require that it should be resisted? If this be not his opinion, we confess our inability to attach any clear meaning to his words. But, if it be his opinion, we think that he will have to expand his chapter on external policy into a lengthy treatise before he can hope to convert many students of elementary politics to his faith. For a foreign minister is the guardian of the interests of his own country, and he has no right to sacrifice those interests to any Quixotic idea which he may entertain about the welfare of other nations.

The same error, we think, may be detected in Professor Sidgwick's argument about the propriety of non-intervention.

'The accepted rules of international duty,' he writes, 'are in the main based on the principle of non-interference; and I shall adopt this as the only principle generally applicable to the relations of civilised States.'

Yet he admits that this principle cannot be universally applied. In cases of 'high-handed aggression'—

'where the assailant is clearly in the wrong I think that any powerful neighbouring State—even if its own interests are not directly threatened—ought to manifest a general readiness to co-operate in forcible suppression of the wrong. . . . Unless we suppose that the mere exercise of superior force is kept under some check by the fear of the intervention of other States against palpable injustice, war between States decidedly unequal in strength will hardly retain its moral character at all. . . . And I think that co-operation to prevent wanton breaches of international peace is the best mode of preparing the way for the ultimate federation of civilised States, to which I look forward. But in the present state of civilisation it would, I think, be a mistake to try to prevent wars altogether in this way. We may hope to put down by it palpable and high-handed aggression, including perhaps the refusal to submit minor points to arbitration; but it is not applicable where there is a conflict of reasonable claims, too vague and doubtful to be clearly settled by general consent, and at the same time too serious to be submitted to arbitration.'

And he goes on to illustrate his position by the present relations of France and Germany. He holds that the war of 1870 was substantially an aggression on the part of the French; that Germany, having won, had a right to take guarantees against its repetition; that the dismemberment actually inflicted was a punishment in which no civilised

nation could be expected to acquiesce; and accordingly, if France should go to war for the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine, she will have the advantage of Professor Sidgwick's sympathy. But, at the same time, the claim of Germany to retain the provinces would seem so far defensible that he would not regard it as a clear duty of neighbouring States to interfere on either side.

Throughout this passage Professor Sidgwick overlooks the chief considerations by which the propriety of intervention or non-intervention is usually determined. The main argument for non-intervention seems to be that intervention tends to widen the area over which the evils inseparable from warfare extend. It converts, or may convert, a local struggle into a general war. Take, for example, the war which stripped Denmark of its German, or partly German, provinces of Schleswig-Holstein. Whatever may have been the remote causes of that war, most Englishmen were of opinion at the time that, from the manner in which it was undertaken, it constituted an act of 'palpable and high-handed aggression;' the leading members of Lord Palmerston's administration had every desire to interfere on behalf of Denmark; they did not do so because they ascertained that France would only co-operate with this country on conditions which would have necessarily converted a campaign in Schleswig into a war which would have extended immediately to Venetia and the Rhine. Austria and Prussia were consequently permitted to carry out their programme, and Denmark was suffered to fight out her hopeless battle alone.

Moreover, the instance which Professor Sidgwick cites as a case for a policy of non-intervention seems singularly inappropriate. This country did not intervene between Germany and France in 1870 because it was generally concluded that British interests were not directly concerned in the transfer of Alsace-Lorraine from the defeated to the victorious combatant. It would not presumably interfere if the struggle for the possession of these provinces were unfortunately renewed, because again it would have no direct interest in the result of the struggle. But it does not follow that the war of 1870 might not have led to issues which would have necessitated its active interference. An attack upon Belgium would have drawn England into the field. An attack upon either Holland or Belgium would draw it into the field now. The clear interests of this country would be involved; and England would have to fight again, as she has had to fight

before, in support of her own interests. Thus the propriety of intervention or non-intervention is not solely determined by considerations of sympathy or right; it is usually governed by the interests of the intervening State; and statesmen hesitate to interfere, when those interests are not imperilled, by a natural reluctance to extend—as intervention must necessarily extend—the area of the contest.

We have commented with some freedom on the conclusions to which deductive reasoning has led Professor Sidgwick, as we think that his neglect of experience has occasionally led him into errors from which a process of induction would have saved him. But, whatever may be the case with that part of Professor Sidgwick's work which deals with the functions of government, we cannot help feeling that deduction has led our author occasionally astray in dealing with the structure of governments. Professor Sidgwick is apparently of opinion that every form of government which has hitherto existed in the world is capable of improvement, and is prepared to devise a constitution, for any State which will adopt it, superior to any which history or experience enables us to examine.

In dealing with this portion of his subject Professor Sidgwick finds fault with Austin's famous definition of a sovereign. Austin argued that 'the sovereign in any community is that determinate person, or aggregate of persons, combined in a certain manner, whom the bulk of the community habitually obey.' Professor Sidgwick contends that this conclusion is not 'appropriate in the case of a community where there is a constitution limiting the ordinary legislature, and only alterable by a process different from that of ordinary legislation.'

'Take (e.g.) the constitution of Belgium, which has remained unchanged for fifty years. A Belgian's right to worship or not worship as he pleases, to start a school or a newspaper, to assemble without arms (if not in the open air), and the very important right of not being deprived of his property without compensation, are guaranteed by the constitution, and cannot legitimately be impaired by ordinary legislation. The constitution itself, however, is alterable by a process determined in the constitution itself, of which the main points are (1) that no constitutional change can be made without a general election intervening between its commencement and its conclusion, so that two successive pairs of chambers must concur in it; and (2) that when the change is finally passed, two-thirds of the members of each chamber must be present, and two-thirds of those present must vote for the change. Now can we say—as Austin must in consistency say—that this complex combination of elected bodies

along with the king, constitutes the real sovereign, of which the ordinary legislature is only a subordinate with delegated authority? Surely it strains language to say that Belgians "habitually" obey a combination of bodies that has never been summoned to exercise its functions for fifty years: especially since the requirement of a two-thirds majority may render a change constitutionally impossible, even though a majority of the assembly and of the people may desire it. It is evident that in this, and in similar cases, there is an actual organ of government whose commands are habitually obeyed, and a possible organ of government whose power is legally unlimited: but that the two do not coincide, and that the latter may at any given time be incapable of coming into existence at all, owing to the balanced state of opinion. But, further, it is quite conceivable that certain clauses in the constitution may be formally declared unalterable; in which case a sovereign, as conceived by Austin, would be impossible.'

But if Austin were alive he would probably reply that the sovereignty in Belgium is shared by the king and the electors, who periodically choose the senate and the chamber of representatives. The electors, by choosing their representatives, do not part with their portion of the sovereignty; they merely delegate the exercise of it to those whom they choose. But on the expiration or dissolution of parliament 'the delegated share in the sovereignty reverts to the 'delegating body.' In other words, according to Austin, sovereignty in Belgium during the continuance of a parliament is possessed by king, senate, and representatives; while, at the expiration of a parliament, it reverts to the king and the electoral body. Austin, moreover, expressly stated that the delegating electoral body might delegate its power either absolutely or conditionally, or subject to a trust or trusts. He would, therefore, have evidently held that the senate and representatives in Belgium receive their delegated powers subject to the trust that they should make no change in the constitution without reference to the electorate, and that even a new parliament should make no such change without the concurrence of a majority of two-thirds of each chamber. Stated in this manner, Austin's definition of sovereignty seems perfectly applicable to the existing constitution of Belgium; and the doubt which Professor Sidgwick has cast on it is due to his imperfect apprehension of Austin's meaning.

We are the more anxious to vindicate Austin's position in this matter because we can hardly hope to form clear conceptions of law or jurisprudence without realising what sovereignty is and what it implies. So thoroughly was Austin aware of this that he illustrated the nature of

sovereignty with what some of his later critics have thought needless iteration. We are not prepared to endorse this criticism. The great advantage that most men have derived from his definition of sovereignty is that it has given them an idea, and distinct ideas on fundamental subjects are not so common that we can afford to quarrel with the writer who dwells on them with undue persistence. And that the persistence was not wholly unnecessary may be inferred from the circumstance that so careful a thinker as Professor Sidgwick has not fully grasped Austin's meaning. If, indeed, we derive from Austin the advantage of a distinct idea, the disadvantage attaching to Professor Sidgwick's criticism is that the idea is confused. Sovereignty with the first writer becomes a fact from which other consequences follow; sovereignty with the later writer becomes a doubt on which we can base nothing.

We must now, however, proceed to examine what Professor Sidgwick calls the methods and instruments of government. He sees clearly enough that every government requires (1) a judicial organ to decide whether and by whom laws have been broken; (2) an executive organ to prevent and punish such breaches; and (3) a legislative organ whose duty it will be, *inter alia*, to frame the laws. He sees also that the executive should, as a general rule, be dependent on, and the judicial organ independent of, the legislature. The independence of the judicial organ, he thinks, can be best secured by declaring that judges in all grades should ordinarily hold office during good behaviour, and that the power of dismissal required to meet cases of misbehaviour or grave unfitness should be nominally exercised by a body of judges of the highest grade. In the case of judges of the highest grade dismissal ought to be a very rare event; if the occasion for it should arise, Professor Sidgwick proposes to constitute a special court, chiefly composed of members of the legislature, with power to deal with the matter. The control of a tribunal so constituted seems necessary, in the last resort, to secure that the judges loyally apply the law laid down by the legislature.

Thus, in the appointment of judges, Professor Sidgwick thinks that the arrangement adopted in this country, where they hold office during good behaviour, is the best practicable. But we fail to see why he should not also adopt the system in force here for their removal. Judges are removable in the United Kingdom by the Crown on addresses from the two Houses of Parliament, a plan which apparently secures

them the independence which Professor Sidgwick rightly considers necessary, and at the same time gives to Parliament, in the last resort, that control over the judicature which we agree with the Professor in thinking essential. We can see no reason for substituting an arrangement which has not been tried for an arrangement that has worked well. The point is of more importance because when Professor Sidgwick proceeds to deal with the constitution of the executive, with the relations of the executive to the legislature, and, lastly, with the legislature itself, we notice a similar disposition on his part to abandon systems which have been found efficient by experience for methods to which the Professor's deductive reasoning has led him. So far as the constitution of the executive is concerned, indeed, Professor Sidgwick is unable to suggest any important deviation from our present practice. The officials in the public service should, he thinks, be adequately remunerated, and, except in the higher posts, should be selected by competitive examination. Responsibility in each department should be concentrated in one individual, who in some important cases should be assisted by a consultative council, and the heads of the more important departments should form a council or cabinet. The relations of this cabinet to the legislature will necessarily vary in different countries. In Germany, for instance, where a form of government has been established which our author calls simple constitutional monarchy, the responsibility of ministers 'means primarily—if not solely—their liability to 'punishment for illegal or corrupt use of their power; in 'the English view the most important part of the meaning 'is that ministers are liable to dismissal if their policy is dis-'approved by a majority of the representative assembly and 'of the electorate.' In his twenty-second chapter Professor Sidgwick has considered the advantages and disadvantages of the two systems. English parliamentary government has the merit of securing harmony between the legislature and the executive. But, on the other hand, it has the defect, which is avoided in Germany, of entrusting

'the leadership of the different departments of the executive to persons who are not—from a strictly executive point of view—experts. The premier's choice of the heads of departments is seriously limited by the connexion of the cabinet with the legislature. He is practically forced to select them among the leading speakers of his party in the representative assembly, in order that the defence of his measures before the assembly may be as strong as possible. Hence, though

they are likely to be persons of oratorical talent and of parliamentary tact, there is no adequate presumption that they will possess administrative ability; still less that they will possess the special knowledge required for particular departments. . . . Hence [again], especially when there are rapid changes of ministry, the heads of departments are liable to be persons who are not really qualified for managing, and, if well advised, do not attempt to manage, the business of their departments. And thus it may be said that English constitutional monarchy results not only in one sham, but a complex system of shams; we have not only a ruler who merely pretends to rule, but also ministers who merely pretend to administer.

All this is not very new, and a good deal of it is not very true. Whatever defects may exist in our English system of government, we doubt whether anyone acquainted with the interior economy of the great departments of State would admit that we have 'ministers who merely pretend to administer.' The complaint which is usually made is the exact reverse—that the parliamentary chief of an office, with no special skill or experience, is able to override the advice of his experienced and skilful subordinates. But we very much doubt whether there is much importance in this latter contention. There is a great deal of force in Bagehot's argument that 'special experience is not so important as the critics of parliamentary ministers imply; most businesses being more like each other in their upper posts than in their lower.' What is really required in the head of a great State department is not that he should have experience, but that he should have the aid of experienced advisers; not that he should apply his own knowledge, but that he should display common sense in using the knowledge of his subordinates. We sometimes, indeed, are inclined to think that the specialist is the worst possible administrator; for the specialist, if he has the force of an able man, is too apt to attach undue importance to his own conclusions on his own subject, and to pay too little attention to the contrary opinions of other people.

Moreover, persons who complain of the inefficiency of parliamentary ministers always overlook one point in which their efficiency is undoubted. It is possible that an ideal war minister, for example, may not be found in the House of Commons. But it is almost certain that the House of Commons will supply the best possible war minister for a constitutional monarchy like our own. For one of the most important functions of a minister of war is to explain in parliament the measures which are necessary for the welfare of the country. And even if we admit that a mili-

tary man is more competent than a civilian, instructed by all the best military men, to devise these measures, we must, at any rate, allow that the civilian, with oratorical talent and parliamentary experience, is far more likely to carry them. The truth is that, so long as parliamentary government exists, the efficiency of the public service will require that the heads of the great departments of the State should be chosen from among the men who have the ear of parliament; and the writers who complain that when so chosen they are usually devoid of special experience, overlook the fact that parliamentary experience is the particular kind of experience which is indispensable in a constitutional minister.

It is instructive to observe that these considerations are so powerful that they actually affect those countries where ministers are not responsible in an English sense to the legislature. As Professor Sidgwick writes:—

‘It seems to me that what I have called simple constitutional monarchy must always have a certain tendency to pass over into the English type. For the control over administration which must, I conceive, be allowed to the representative assembly, if its control over taxation is to be a reality, is so considerable that a monarch who wishes to get any expensive plans carried out will always find it more convenient to manage parliament than to fight it. He will thus be led to take as his first minister a person who has the confidence of the majority in the house of representatives, to avoid the annoyance and weakness resulting from friction with the assembly. A minister so chosen, and having consequently so strong a position independent of the monarch’s favour, will have a certain tendency to acquire the control of executive functions.’

Thus, even ‘in simple constitutional monarchies,’ to use Professor Sidgwick’s phrase, power tends to pass from the monarch to the minister, and its passage tends to increase the authority and control of the legislature. It is, in these circumstances, of the first importance that the legislature of a country should be so constituted as not only to command the confidence of the people, but to preserve a cautious, wise, and consistent policy.

It is interesting, on this subject, to observe that Professor Sidgwick’s deductive reasoning has led him to the conclusion that the legislature should consist of two chambers. ‘A second chamber,’ as he puts it in the analysis of his text, ‘is useful in checking hasty legislation, [in] impeding combinations of sinister interests, and [in] supplementing the deficiencies of the primary representative assembly.’ But

he does not propose that the two assemblies should have co-ordinate powers.

‘In a country like England, where the existing distribution of power is the result of a process of gradual change, a second chamber invested formally with co-ordinate powers, but practically restricted in their exercise by custom and opinion . . . may work tolerably well. But if, in framing a new constitution, we desire to combine the advantages of a two-chambered legislature with those of a parliamentary executive, it would seem better to recognise formally the subordinate position of the senate by limiting its power of resisting a legislative measure approved both by the house of representatives and by the people.’

And he goes on to suggest that, when a measure has been rejected by the senate for three successive years, a direct vote of the electorate should be taken upon it. How this vote should be taken he does not, however, explain. As the electorate is constituted in England it would seem almost impracticable. For the majority of the whole electorate need not necessarily correspond with the majority of the votes of the representatives of the several constituencies. In a direct referendum, a populous constituency would necessarily supply more votes than a smaller constituency which returns an equal number of members. It would seem, therefore, that, if Professor Sidgwick’s proposal were adopted—and we regard its adoption as both unlikely and undesirable—it would necessarily lead to manhood suffrage and equal electoral districts.

If Professor Sidgwick is not in favour of ‘ending’ the House of Lords, we do not observe that he has any plan for ‘mending’ it. But, in framing a new constitution for a modern country, he thinks that the senate ought to represent superior culture or political enlightenment rather than wealth. As, however, he considers that the senate, in order to be strong, must in some way or other be the creation of popular election, it is not easy to see how the result which he desires is to be secured. When, indeed, he examines the method by which the senate should be elected, he displays, almost unconsciously, the inherent and perhaps insoluble difficulty of devising a practical scheme. Rejecting the election of a limited class of citizens as invidious; rejecting a method of secondary election as inexpedient, because the electors elected by the people for the purpose of the election ‘would be liable to become puppets;’ rejecting also the system in force in the United States as unlikely to succeed ‘where the local governments are less dignified and important

'than they naturally are in a federal system,' he arrives at the conclusion that 'the members of the senate should be (1) fewer in number and so chosen from larger districts, (2) appointed for a longer period, and (3) on the plan of 'partial renewal.' We can only say that the suggestion convinces us that it is much easier to criticise what exists than to devise anything better. A senate elected by the same persons who choose the lower chamber, but who should be shuffled for the purpose into different electoral districts, and summoned for the purpose at distant intervals, will probably bear so close a resemblance to the house of representatives that its continuance would be hardly worth fighting for.

In devising an electorate for the lower chamber Professor Sidgwick is on more familiar and therefore easier ground. He considers that the electorate should comprise all self-supporting sane adults; but he has the good sense to recommend that extreme ignorance, crime, disgraceful conduct, pauperism, and bankruptcy should exclude from it. He discards Mr. Hare's system for the representation of minorities, contending that the electors should be divided locally into electoral districts; but he thinks that the single-member constituencies, which were introduced by the last Reform Act, have the disadvantage 'of breaking up for electoral purposes portions of the community—such as towns generally are—which tend to have an intimate internal cohesion in the economic and social life, and consequently important common interests.' Anyone qualified to be an elector should be qualified to be elected; but no salary should be attached to the representative, (1) because 'in societies as wealthy as modern States generally are it cannot be difficult to find an adequate number of persons, qualified by nature and training, and enjoying pecuniary independence, to devote themselves to this important and interesting work, which, if public opinion is in a healthy state, they will regard at once as a duty and an honour.' And (2) a representative assembly, so constituted, 'will tend to maintain a higher standard of pecuniary incorruptibility than would, *ceteris paribus*, be likely to be found in an assembly of paid professional legislators, unless they were paid much more highly than has ever been proposed.' There are two other conclusions to which deductive reasoning has led Professor Sidgwick which it is necessary to notice. In considering the constitution of a legislature, he says that the function of making or modifying laws

should be entrusted to persons who are thoroughly acquainted with the laws that they are called upon to modify.

‘Accordingly, we may lay down without hesitation that men who have that thorough knowledge of law which we can, generally speaking, only expect to find in able and experienced members of the legal profession, should have a large and responsible share in law making. Proposed laws should be drawn up by lawyers, and any changes made in the draft should be carefully revised by lawyers. But for several reasons it does not seem desirable to entrust the substantial work of legislation entirely, or even mainly, to them alone.’

We are not sure that we understand the meaning of this passage. If, however, Professor Sidgwick only intends to say that acts of parliament should be drawn by draftsmen who are competent lawyers, it is hardly worth while discussing a suggestion from which no one is likely to dissent; but if, on the contrary, he means—as his words seem to imply—that these skilled lawyers should have the right of modifying amendments made by the legislature, his suggestion seems fatal to parliamentary government. Amendments, though they are only verbal, introduced into acts, may modify their whole meaning; and a body that was competent to revise the work of the legislature would necessarily become not merely a revising but a legislating body. If, in other words, the legislature is to be entrusted with the work of legislation, it must be the sole judge of the language in which its laws shall be framed. It cannot allow that language to be revised by persons exterior to itself without delegating to those persons a portion of its legislative duties.

The other suggestion which Professor Sidgwick makes has already been partly considered in this article. In examining the control which the people ought to exercise over their representatives in Parliament, he rejects the notion that the representative should be regarded as an agent appointed to carry out the wishes of his constituents, and liable to dismissal if his views should differ from theirs. On the contrary, opposed to what he calls ‘the absurdity of “folly” “controlling skill,”’ he thinks that a member would be guilty of a plain dereliction of duty who did ‘not follow his own best judgement, even when it brings him into conflict with the temporary opinions and sentiments of a majority of his constituents.’ He is accordingly against the introduction of ‘what is known in Switzerland as the obligatory referendum,’ and would neither entrust the people with the

initiation of legislation nor submit acts of parliament to the electors before they became valid as laws. But, though he dislikes the introduction of the referendum for the purpose of either initiating or approving legislation, he is in favour of the direct legislative intervention of the citizens (1) when a deadlock results from a disagreement between the two chambers, and (2) 'when changes are proposed in constitutional rules designed to have greater stability than ordinary laws.' It is very difficult to see, however, why the mass of the nation can be trusted to decide on such serious questions as those which are involved in a difference between the senate and the house of representatives, and the reform of constitutional rules, if it cannot be allowed either to initiate or approve other projected legislation. If fully should not be allowed to control skill in the one case, why should skill prostrate itself before folly in the other? Either an obligatory referendum should be adopted or not; but, if it is to be adopted at all, it cannot apparently be confined to the solitary uses for which Professor Sidgwick would reserve it.

In this country, indeed, and its autonomous dependencies, one of the two cases in which our author proposes to resort to the referendum cannot apparently arise, for it is the singular good fortune of England that its constitution has grown with its requirements, and has never been included within the four corners of any formal document. Some of its provisions may no doubt be found in acts of parliament, more or less venerable, which are, however, just as susceptible of modification as other acts bound in the same volumes; and others of them may be traced in the order books of one or other of the houses of parliament. But the most characteristic features of the English system of government cannot be gathered from any State paper. The Cabinet has no legal existence; the tacit understanding which prohibits the Crown from refusing its sanction to an act passed by both branches of the legislature only rests on the uniform practice of nearly two centuries. The theory that the House of Lords may reject a measure on which the opinion of the country is pronounced once, but may not reject it during two successive parliaments, has had its origin since the first Reform Act. The opinion that a minister, decisively beaten at the polls, should resign office without meeting parliament, was never heard of before the autumn of 1868. These are only familiar instances of the changes, unexpressed in any formal document, which are constantly

being introduced into the British constitution. But other examples might easily be found in the relations of the crown to the legislature and in the two branches of the legislature to each other. There is nothing in the statute book, for instance, to prevent the crown converting a minority of the House of Lords into a majority by the wholesale creation of new peers. There is nothing in the statute book to prevent the House of Lords from amending a money bill. It is even doubtful whether any formal reason could be given why a peer of parliament should not enter the House of Commons. In these and many other matters the constitution rests not on law, but on usage; and, in many respects, what is constitutional, in England is only that which is customary.

A constitution of this kind, perpetually adapting itself to the changes and requirements of the age and of the country, hardly falls within the range of a doctrinaire writer like Professor Sidgwick. Yet it has advantages to recommend it which are denied to the immutable constitutions of other countries. For it seems almost impossible for the wit of man to devise a constitution which will be permanently suited to any country, and it is certain that what is suited to the genius of one race will be ill adapted to the opinions of another. The example of the United States is not opposed to this view. Rigid as the American constitution is, Professor Bryce has shown that it 'has been changed, is being changed, will continue to be changed, by interpretation and usage. It is not what it was even thirty years ago; who can tell what it will be thirty years hence?' If this be the experience of a country, whose constitution is nominally so rigid as that of the American commonwealth, it seems to us useless to follow Professor Sidgwick in devising constitutions for either old or new countries. Each people must be left to work out its own form of government, and the form which a government will assume will probably be very different from the anticipations and conclusions of the clearest deductive reasoner.

ART. V.—*Mémoires du Général Baron de Marbot.* Tomes I., II.
Paris: 1891.

THESE volumes are another of the innumerable works which illustrate the great epic of war that fills the first years of the present century, and we do not hesitate to say that they are inferior to none of the series in animation, veracity, and interest. Few books of our time have acquired so great and immediate a popularity. The late General Marbot was a distinguished soldier of the French Revolution and First Empire, who served with high honour in the Grand Army in its march over Europe under Napoleon; and who, having taken part in its eventful fortunes from Marengo and Wagram, to Leipzig and Waterloo, was made a peer of France by the monarchy of July, and lived to see Napoleon III. on the throne. In 1844, when on the verge of old age, the veteran addressed himself to the task of recording his reminiscences of the past, and the volumes before us are the first instalment of a work which, though designed by the author to be only 'a simple family narrative,' has been rightly offered to the general reader by the owners of the original manuscript. We shall reserve our remarks on the third volume, which has just appeared, for another occasion. The book not only reproduces what Bacon has called the genius of an extraordinary time in singularly vivid and lifelike characters; it not only takes us to the famous battle-fields on which France met and overthrew the hosts of old Europe, it adds largely to our information on important passages of the history of the war. Yet, as was to be expected in a work of the kind, the personal side of General Marbot's narrative is its most striking and interesting part; and the many well-chosen anecdotes he recounts, in a simple and natural manner, place clearly before us the living images of Napoleon in his tent, his camp, and his closet, of the company of his ennobled marshals, and of the Grand Army. Not the least pleasing feature of the book, certainly, is the portrait the author has drawn of himself, unconsciously, but like a true artist; he was an admirable type of the *homme de guerre* in the army of France; intrepid, dashing, and bold to a fault, but intelligent, adroit, abounding in resource, and no mean judge of military operations; and, indeed, as we survey his brilliant feats of arms, and recollect how important were his many services, we are rather surprised that he had only attained the rank of colonel before Waterloo. Yet it must

be said that although M. de Marbot appears not to have been devoid of personal feelings of humanity, no writer has ever given the world a more revolting picture of the barbarity of war. He relates the wholesale massacre of thousands of unoffending adversaries and of his own countrymen, and the devastation of Europe, without the slightest remorse; and we turn from his pages with the sickening conviction that, at certain periods, the most ferocious animal in creation is—man. On the whole the *Memoirs* completely justify a wish expressed by Napoleon in his last moments: ‘I enjoin,’ the dying exile wrote in his will, ‘Colonel Marbot to continue to write in defence of the glory of the French army;’* and this flattering commission was accompanied by a legacy of 100,000 francs.

Marcellin de Marbot, born in 1782, was a scion of a noble, but not wealthy, family, which had lived for ages on its ancestral lands by the banks of the Dordogne, in a southern nook of Limousin. His father entered the body guards of Louis XV., became an aide-de-camp of General Schomberg, rather an eminent soldier of the old monarchy; and, being one of the Liberals of the day, was returned to the Legislative Assembly in 1791 as a deputy for the new department of the Corrèze. His mother, an aunt of the fine old veteran who commanded our allies in the Crimea during the first part of the siege of Sebastopol, and who gained honour for his defence of St. Privat on the great and terrible day of Gravelotte, belonged to the house of Certain de Canrobert, another branch of the noblesse of Limousin; and the author tells us how one of his parents, when on duty on the terraces of Versailles, often met Berthier, then an obscure engraver, but afterwards the chief of Napoleon’s staff; and how the other sent a handsome shop boy, who was to become the wearer of the crown of Naples, on many an errand to a country village. When the Revolution passed into its stage of violence, dissensions arose in the before united families; M. de Marbot joined the Conventional levies, and did good service on the Pyrenean frontier; the Certains threw in their lot with the émigrés, and were marked out for popular vengeance; and Madame de Marbot, who, despite the ‘civism’ of her republican lord, had to endure the sight of half-savage peasants tossing his title deeds into patriotic flames, betook herself to the house of a friend in the neigh-

* This refers to a refutation, by the author, of a pamphlet by General Roguier, one of the many detractors of Napoleon at the Restoration.

bourhood of Rennes. An accident prevented young Marcellin from accompanying his mother in her flight, and he was brought up, during his first absence from home, at a good school near the town of Turenne. He was released from this pupilage in 1793 by his father, now a distinguished general in command of a large camp near Toulouse, and numbering among his most promising officers Lannes and Augereau, Napoleon's future marshals; and he was placed at the then famous seminary of Sorèze, a Benedictine foundation happily spared by the plundering hands of the men in power in Paris. The reign of Jacobinism was now at its height, and this book contains one or two sketches of the detestable scenes of this revolting period. The author confirms the universal judgement of history on the Terrorist leaders: they were despicable wretches raised by the play of insolent fortune to a bad eminence; and it is a disgrace to France that she bowed her head to their yoke.

‘I shall not speak here of the system of oppression that prevailed in our unhappy country; History has made it known to you; but harsh as may be the colours in which she has painted the horrors of which the Terrorists were guilty, the picture will always fall far short of the reality. The most surprising thing of all was the stupidity of the masses, in allowing themselves to be ruled by men for the most part without capacity; for, whatever may have been said, nearly all the Conventionals were beings of singular mediocrity; their boasted courage was due to their fear of each other; and they consented to everything their leaders willed from dread of the guillotine. During my exile, in 1815, I met many Conventionals, who, compelled, like myself, to leave France, had not the least strength of character; they have since acknowledged to me that they voted the death of Louis XVI., and assented to numberless odious decrees, simply in order to save their own heads.’

Young Marbot was at Sorèze for nearly six years, and joined his father in Paris in the summer of 1799. The world and France had changed since 1793; the star of Bonaparte had risen and dazzled Europe; but the terrible reverses of 1799 had effaced Campo Formio and the triumphs of 1796; the victor of Rivoli was far away in Egypt; Masséna alone held his ground in Switzerland; and France was threatened with invasion on the Var and the Rhine. The energy of the Reign of Terror had, also, disappeared; the Directory could not steer the vessel of the State; and between disasters abroad, disorder at home, the disorganisation of society and far spreading anarchy, the Republic seemed on the very edge of ruin. The extreme of danger, as is well known, was averted by the mistakes of the

Allies, and by Masséna's splendid success at Zürich; but we learn for the first time from this work that the Directory actually had resolved to supersede Masséna before his victory—a step that might have destroyed France.

'The Directory, indignant when they had become aware that Masséna would not obey their repeated orders that he should fight a battle, determined to dismiss him; but as they feared that the general-in-chief would not pay any attention to this, and would put the despatch in his pocket, if it were transmitted to him by a courier, the minister of war was enjoined to send a staff officer to Switzerland charged to notify to Masséna his dismissal in public, and to give Cherin, the chief of the staff, a letter appointing him to the command of the army. Bernadotte, the minister at war, informed my father confidentially of these arrangements; General Marbot disapproved of them, and made Bernadotte understand how dangerous it was, on the eve of a decisive engagement, to deprive the army in Switzerland of a commander in whom it placed its trust. . . . My father persuaded the minister to confide this mission to M. Gault, his aide-de-camp. M. Gault, on a pretext that he had been employed to ascertain if the contractors had supplied the number of horses they had promised, went to Switzerland with power either to keep or to hand to Masséna his dismissal, and to give General Cherin the despatch conferring on him the command, as circumstances would show the expediency or the danger of this course. It was an immense authority entrusted to a mere captain! M. Gault did not belie the good opinion that had been formed of him. When he reached the head-quarters of the army in Switzerland five days before the battle of Zürich, he saw the troops so full of confidence in their chief, and Masséna so calm and firm, that he had no doubt success was at hand; and keeping his secret powers completely to himself, he took part in the battle of Zürich, and finally returned to Paris. Masséna never had a notion that this modest subaltern had possessed the means of depriving him of the glory of winning one of the most brilliant victories of the age.'

These volumes confirm the vague tradition that Sieyès, far the ablest of the five directors, was so convinced that a master hand was required to be at the helm of the State, that he tried to communicate with Napoleon in Egypt, and only turned to Moreau when the attempt failed.

'Sieyès, with the assistance of Saliceti, the Corsican deputy, sent a secret and trustworthy agent to Egypt to inform General Bonaparte of the unhappy condition of France, and to ask him to come over and place himself at the head of the Government.'

General Marbot was in command, at this time, of the military force in and round Paris, and Sieyès asked him to second a *coup d'état*. The General, however, a sincere republican, refused to take part in intrigues of the kind, and

he was relegated to active service abroad. His command, as is well known, was given to Lefebvre, a rude soldier, who at once yielded to the arts of Napoleon, when the decision came; it is a curious speculation if the 18th Brumaire, with its prodigious results, would have been successful had General Marbot retained his post.

“My father called on Sieyès, resigned his command of the divisions of Paris, and asked for the command of a division in the field. Sieyès made haste to comply with his request; he was glad to get rid of a man whose strength of character and sense of duty might have prevented the success of the *coup d'état*.”

General Marbot was despatched to the army of Italy; and Marcellin, who had just entered the service as a private in the hussars of Berchény, a celebrated regiment of the old monarchy, accompanied his father on his way to the Var. On reaching Lyons, the travellers found the city in a state of enthusiastic joy. Napoleon had suddenly returned from Egypt, and the population hailed him as the deliverer of France. Bonaparte characteristically tried to gain over the republican soldier after his wonted fashion, and with his usual adroitness he concealed his failure.

“My father returned the visit of General Bonaparte. They walked together for a long time in the little garden of the mansion; their suites respectfully kept at a distance. We saw them sometimes making eager gestures, sometimes conversing in a calm way; at last, Bonaparte, approaching my father, with a coaxing manner, took his arm in a friendly fashion. This was probably to make the municipal authorities in the courtyard, and the many curious lookers-on from the windows, believe and say that General Marbot had become an adherent of General Bonaparte. This able man neglected no means to attain his ends; he fascinated many, and wished it to be understood that he had gained over even those who opposed him on principle. He was wonderfully successful.”

Marcellin had now begun his career, and his reminiscences give us most curious pictures of the republican army of France at this time. It was still characterised by the rude disorder, the licentiousness, and the want of discipline of the huge levies of 1793; and, indeed, as the Duc de Fézensac has clearly shown, Napoleon himself was never able completely to free the Grand Army from defects which his system of making war encouraged, though he tried to remove them. Extraordinary figures appeared in the ranks: Marcellin was put in the hands of a mentor, placed distinctly before us in this graphic sketch:—

“He presented himself to my father, and what did we see? A jolly

fellow, very well set up indeed, but with his shako over his ears, his sabre trailing behind him, his face irradiated and cut in two by a huge scar, moustaches half a foot long, and, being stiffened with wax, running into his ears, two big masses of hair plaited at the temples, which, falling down from his shako, reached his breast, and with all this a look! the look of a vagabond made worse by words that were jerked out, and by a perfectly barbarous Alsatian jargon.'

A savage of this type had attained the grade of general; but savages of this type had done great deeds.

'I happened to see General Macard, a soldier of fortune raised by the revolutionary tempest, almost at once, from the rank of head trumpeter to that of a general officer. General Macard, a genuine type of those officers whom chance and their courage created, and who, while they displayed true valour when before the enemy, were nevertheless unfitted, owing to their want of education, to fill high posts properly, was well known for his extraordinary peculiarities. This singular personage, a giant, and exceptionally brave, when he was about to charge at the head of his troops, used to call out, "Now, then, I shall dress myself up like a wild beast." He then took off his coat, waistcoat, and shirt, and kept on only his plumed hat, his leathern breeches, and his large jack boots. When naked in this way to the waist, General Macard presented to the sight a bust as hairy as a bear; and this gave his person the strangest appearance! When dressed as a wild beast, as he said very correctly, General Macard rushed furiously, sword in hand, upon the enemy's horsemen, swearing like a heathen; but he seldom reached them, for at the extraordinary and terrible sight of this half-naked giant, half stripped, covered with hair, and so uncouth of aspect, who charged headlong, with frightful howling, the enemies betook themselves to flight, uncertain whether they had to deal with a man or some ferocious animal.'

The odious apprenticeship to which gentlemen, compelled to enter the ranks as privates, were subjected, is seen in the following passage; and though Napoleon curtailed it as much as he dared, he was unable, the Duc de Fézensac tells us, to abolish it wholly in the Grand Army, so strong was the passion for equality in the French soldiery, a result of their hatred of the exclusive privilege from which they had long cruelly suffered:—

'I had just laid me down, on the first night that I spent in barracks, when a great hulking hussar, coming in an hour later than the others, approached my bed, and, seeing that somebody was in it, unhooks the lamp, and puts it under my nose to examine me more nearly. He then begins to undress himself. I did not suppose, though I looked on, that he intended to place himself at my side; but I was quickly undeceived. "Shove aside, conscript," he said in a rough tone. He then gets into the bed, takes three-quarters of it to himself, and begins to snore! I could not close my eyes, chiefly on account of the dis-

gusting smell caused by a big bundle which my companion had put on the bolster to raise his head. I could not make out what this could be. To discover it I put my hand gently on the thing: it was a leathern apron, full of the cobbler's wax used by shoemakers to wax their threads. My amiable comrade was one of the workmen of the bootmaker of the regiment.'

General Marbot and his son were at Nice when the news arrived of the 18th Brumaire; and it deserves notice that the *coup d'état* had opponents even in the old army of Italy. Unquestionably, however, France and Paris were almost unanimous in their approval of the Revolution that made Bonaparte supreme.

'Whatever may have been his anticipation of the future, my father congratulated himself on not having been in Paris on the 18th Brumaire; and had he been there, I think he would have boldly resisted General Bonaparte in his enterprise. But being with the army, and at the head of a division before the enemy, he chose to confine himself to the passive obedience of a soldier. He rejected the proposals made to him by several generals and colonels, to march on Paris at the head of their troops.' "Who," he said, "will defend our frontiers if we abandon them, and what will become of France if we add the calamities of civil to those of foreign war?"'

The attitude of Moreau is thus well described: it is only a proof of the blindness of faction that he was soon thought of as a ruler of France; as is well known, he succumbed at once to Napoleon's influence, and was made a mere instrument to perform the ignoble service of watching the Directory on the 18th Brumaire:—

'It is certain that, for want of a better man, proposals were made to him to place himself at the head of the party which wished to overthrow the Directory, and that the reins of the State were to be put in his hands, with the title of president or consul. Moreau, an able and brave soldier, had no political courage, and probably he distrusted his own capacity to direct the affairs of France in their existing state of confusion. Besides, he was egotistical and indolent; he did not trouble himself about the future of his country; and he preferred the quiet of private life to the agitation of politics.'

Marcellin began his brilliant career by capturing a detachment of Austrian cavalry at the head of a handful of his hussars—a remarkable exploit for a boy of seventeen, and notable for this, too, that his men made him their leader in the accidental absence of his commanding officer. He was made a sous-lieutenant for this feat of arms, at the instance and with the acclaim of his comrades; and he was ere long shut up, with his father, in Genoa, taking part,

with the general, in the grand defence of Masséna. This memorable siege belongs to history ; it must suffice here to say that in this stern passage of war Masséna gave proof of the great qualities which have placed him in the ranks of illustrious soldiers. He made mistakes, as at Zürich, and before Torres Vedras ; he showed a want of real strategic genius ; he was occasionally indolent and remiss ; but when the stress of adverse fortune lay heavy on him, he displayed extraordinary resource and tenacious boldness. The frightful sufferings endured at Genoa are well illustrated in this narrative. Masséna, irritated at what he thought a breach of faith, put a body of Austrian prisoners on half the wretched pittance doled out to the unconquerable French garrison.

‘ The ration of the French was composed of a quarter of a pound of wretched bread, and of an equal quantity of horseflesh. The prisoners only received half an allowance of each ; therefore they had only a quarter of a pound of food of any kind each day. This happened fifteen days before the end of the siege. The poor devils were all this time treated in the same way. Masséna renewed his offer in vain every two or three days to the Austrian general ; he would not accept it, either from his own obstinacy or because Lord Keith, the English admiral, would not supply him with boats, from fear, it is said, lest they should bring typhus fever into the fleet. However that may be, the miserable Austrians yelled in the hulks, beside themselves with fury and hunger. At last, after having devoured their boots, their knapsacks, their cartridge pouches, and perhaps some dead bodies, they nearly all perished from exhaustion.’

Young Marbot lost his father at the siege of Genoa, a wound, which would have been otherwise trifling, having proved fatal, under frightful conditions, in which the strongest succumbed to want and pestilence. It was characteristic of Masséna’s temper that he would not allow the General funeral rites, from fear of stirring too deeply the soldiers’ feelings. The bereaved son naturally was indignant, but Masséna, ere long, gave the youth a proof of extraordinary esteem and confidence. After the capitulation he sent Marcellin, in company with one officer only, to inform Bonaparte—at this moment advancing from the Po against Melas, after the passage of the Alps, with the army of reserve—of the fall of the nobly defended fortress ; and this was a mission of the first importance. Marbot was one of the very few French soldiers present at Genoa and on the field of Marengo ; and he beheld the march of Desaix and the famous charge of Kellermann, which changed a

defeat into a decisive victory. He had been introduced to Napoleon before at Lyons. He thus describes the First Consul towards the close of the battle:—

‘The First Consul was very anxious, and only recovered his gay manner when our cavalry and the infantry of Desaix, of whose death he was as yet unaware, had assured the victory by overthrowing the column of Zach’s grenadiers. Seeing that my horse was slightly wounded in the thigh, the First Consul pinched my ear, and laughingly said, “*Je te prêterai mes chevaux pour les faire arranger ainsi !*”’

Masséna had offered Marbot a place on his staff, but the youth preferred to return to Paris—he was an affectionate son to a widowed mother—Bernadotte, who had been one of his father’s friends, having promised to put him on the list of his aides-de-camp. The post, however, was given to a brother by mistake, and Marbot served in a light cavalry regiment, in the campaign of 1801, in Portugal, a distant forerunner of that of Torres Vedras. At this time Bernadotte commanded the Army of the West—the old Army of the Rhine and of the Sambre and Meuse, notoriously not well disposed towards Napoleon, and chafing at the prospect of a dangerous exile to St. Domingo, and Marbot gives us very curious details of a conspiracy among the leaders of this force to overthrow the First Consul’s government, which no historian has, we believe, described. Bernadotte, Marbot declares, was the chief author of the plot.

‘If General Bernadotte had had more strength of character, the First Consul would have had to regret that he gave him so important a command, for I can assert at this time of day, without doing harm to anyone, that Bernadotte conspired against Bonaparte and his government.’

The conspiracy had ramifications far and wide, and Moreau probably was not unaware of it. The courage, however, of Bernadotte failed; he eluded the danger from which he hoped to profit. One of his lieutenants, Simon, a brave soldier, who, years afterwards, fell at Busaco, told the whole story to the prefect of Rennes; and Napoleon thought silence the more judicious policy. Still, a military rising on a formidable scale was averted only by a mere accident.

‘On what trifles the destinies of empires hang! Colonel Pinoteau, a firm and determined man, was to have given the signal; his regiment, the 82nd, already drawn up on the square, awaited it impatiently; but Pinoteau, in concert with Foucart, had spent all the morning in preparing proclamations, and he had been so preoccupied that he had forgotten to shave. Midday strikes on the clocks.

Colonel Pinoteau, just about to go to parade, perceives that his beard is not trimmed, and sets about shaving. But while he is thus engaged General Virion, escorted by a number of officers of the *gendarmerie*, hurries into his room, seizes his sword, declares that he is a prisoner, and conducts him to the town, where General Simon already was. A few minutes later and Colonel Pinoteau would have been at the head of ten thousand men, would not have allowed himself to be intimidated by the capture of General Simon, and certainly would have carried out his project of rising against the Consular Government.'

Marcellin's brother was involved in this critical affair; copies of a proclamation, inciting to revolt, were found in a servant's possession through a trick of Bernadotte, and the unlucky aide-de-camp was sent in disgrace to India. Napoleon had long disliked Bernadotte; but from this time forward, though he concealed his feelings, he treated him, Marbot tells us, with increasing distrust.

We next see Marbot at the cavalry school of Versailles, installed in the rooms that had once belonged to the Prince de Lambesc, one of Broglie's officers, when the Revolution broke out in Paris. He was an assiduous student during these years; and the mastery of the French tongue, which appears in his *Memoirs*, shows that he turned his studies to good account. In 1804 he was attached to the staff of Augereau, who, we have seen, had been one of his father's subordinates; and he gives us an interesting sketch of the career of the marshal, one of the most chequered of those of Napoleon's lieutenants. He confirms the story of Marmont that Bonaparte called a council of war before Castiglione, but he differs from Marmont in an essential point—Bonaparte agreed with Augereau, and refused to fall back.

'Bonaparte called a council of war, the only one he ever consulted. All the generals, even Masséna, were for retreating; but Augereau, having explained what ought to be done in order to get out of the difficulty, ended his remarks with these words: "You may all go, but I will stay, and I will attack the enemy, with my division, at the break of day." Bonaparte, struck by Augereau's reasoning, said, "Well, I shall stay with you."'

Marbot briefly describes the conspiracy of George, and the crime of the death of the Duc d'Enghien. His opinions are those of a right-minded man, but he has added nothing to our previous knowledge. In 1805 he was at the camp of Boulogne, and beheld the vast preparations for a descent on our coasts; but his account of the expedition of Villeneuve abounds in errors, and shows how Frenchmen were kept in ignorance of the facts. The following anecdote is given as

one of the hundreds of instances of Napoleon's art in dealing with the French soldier, though to English eyes it looks somewhat apocryphal :—

'The Emperor addressed Marmont, who had served in the artillery. "Come," he said, "let us see if we recollect our old trade, and let us try which of us will send a shell into that English brig which has stood in to annoy us." Upon this the Emperor, moving aside the corporal in command of the piece, points the mortar; word is given to fire, and the shell, grazing the sails of the brig, falls into the sea. Marmont aims in his turn, makes a good shot, but does not strike the brig, which, as there were so many general officers in the battery, redoubles its fire. "Come, go back to your post," said Napoleon to the corporal. He takes aim, and lets a shell fall in the very midst of the brig, which, pierced through and through by the huge projectile, fills at once, and sinks majestically within sight of the whole French army. . . . The Emperor congratulated the corporal, and fastened the cross to his tunic with his own hand.'

The corps of Augereau formed the extreme right wing of the Grand Army, which had been spread from Brittany to the plains of Hanover; and when Napoleon, foiled in his project for the invasion, resolved, as he said, to strike at England through Austria, Marbot took part in the celebrated march which ended in the surrender of Mack at Ulm. He did not, however, witness the fall of the fortress. The corps of Augereau was sent into Suabia to pursue Jellachich, who had escaped from Ulm, and Marbot was chosen by his chief to bear despatches to Masséna, in command of the French in Italy. Marbot saw Jellachich lay down his arms, and tells us interesting details of the gallant conduct of an Hungarian regiment that contrived to get off. He was sent by Augereau, with another officer, to present the captured Austrian flags to the Emperor; and these repeated missions prove his growing position. He shortly describes the advance on Vienna, the capture of the bridges upon the Danube, and the march of Napoleon into Moravia; but his reminiscences merely confirm history. A singular incident which occurred just before Austerlitz adds to the numberless proofs of the Emperor's skill in stratagem. Haugwitz, the envoy of Prussia, as is well known, arrived in the French camp to wait on events, and to declare for or against Napoleon, according to his estimate of the prospects of the war. The Emperor had received the flags of Jellachich long before, but he bethought himself of repeating the scene—one of great ceremony—before Haugwitz, in order to impress the ambassador's mind with the success and the power of the

Grand Army. Marbot was the principal actor in this adroit comedy.

‘I answered the Emperor’s questions, and, entering into his thoughts, painted in vivid colours the defeat of the Austrians, their demoralisation, and the enthusiasm of the French troops. Then, presenting the trophies, one after the other, I gave the names of the enemy’s regiments to which they had belonged. I dwelt particularly on two, for the capture of them was certain to produce a great effect on the Prussian ambassador. “Here,” I said, “is the flag of the infantry of H.M. the Emperor of Austria; and here is the standard of the Uhlans of the Archduke Charles, his brother.” The eyes of Napoleon sparkled, and seemed to say, “Well done, young man!” At last he dismissed us, and as we were leaving we heard him say to the ambassador, “You see, Count, my armies are victorious at all points; the Austrian army has been annihilated, and the same thing will soon befall the Russians.” And Haugwitz seemed thunderstruck.’

The author’s account of the great day of Austerlitz—the most scientific of battles on land, as the Nile was the most scientific at sea—is an excellent piece of military history, clear in outline, and not obscured by details; but we can do no more than refer to it. Marbot was despatched to Rapp by Napoleon himself in the great *mêlée* of the French and Russian Guards, and he nearly lost his life in an heroic effort to save a Russian officer on a fragment of the ice of the lakes shattered by the French artillery. After passing the winter of 1805 at Darmstadt, where Augereau had made himself popular through his clemency to the city of Frankfurt, he was sent with despatches, in the summer of 1806, to the French ambassador still at Berlin; and the Emperor gave him special instructions to observe and report on the Prussian army. He witnessed the effervescence of the Court and the people before war was recklessly declared, and his account of the military power of Prussia is very instructive. As in the analogous case of France in 1870, it was wholly unequal to cope with its enemy.

‘The Prussian troops, though well disciplined, were not fit to measure themselves with ours; their composition and organisation were so bad. In fact, at this period the Prussian captains were owners of their companies or squadrons; men, horses, arms, uniforms, everything in short, belonged to them. It was a kind of property they let to the Government at a stipulated price. As they had to bear the entire losses, the captains had, of course, a direct interest to spare their companies, whether on the march or in the field; and as the number of men they were bound to furnish was fixed, and there was no conscription, they enlisted first all the native Prussians who presented themselves, and next every foreign vagabond seduced by their recruiting

sergeants in neighbouring countries. Still, that did not suffice, and the Prussian recruiting parties used to enlist by sheer force a great number of men who, having become soldiers against their will, were compelled to serve until they were no longer able to bear arms. . . . You can imagine the frightful position of these foreigners, who, having enlisted in a drunken moment, or having been carried away by compulsion, were condemned to be Prussian soldiers—that is to say, slaves—for their whole life, and to exist under a wintry sky, far from their native land. . . . And what an existence! Hardly fed, sleeping on straw, lightly clad, without great coats even in the severest winter, and without pay sufficient for their necessary wants! . . . The Prussian officers were for the most part well informed, and did good service; but half of them were born out of Prussia, and were poor gentlemen, who, having entered the army merely to obtain a subsistence, had no patriotism and no real love of Prussia. Accordingly, when she was in adversity, they nearly all deserted. Besides, as promotion depended on length of service, the large majority of the superior officers were old, broken down, and unable to bear the hardships of war. And it was an army of this kind, thus composed and thus commanded, that was to be matched against the conquerors of Italy, of Egypt, of Germany, of Austerlitz!

The corps of Augereau defiled under the eye of Napoleon as it advanced from Würzburg at the opening of the campaign. This sketch of the spectacle is characteristic, and Marbot's reflections on the Napoleonic system of making war show that he appreciated its merits and defects.

'We found the Emperor at Würzburg; he reviewed the troops of the 7th corps, whose enthusiasm was very great. Napoleon, who had notes about every regiment, and who knew how to make an excellent use of them in order to flatter their self-esteem, said as he saw the 44th of the Line, "You have more chevrons than any corps in my armies. I reckon therefore your three battalions as six!" The exulting soldiery cried out, "We will prove it when before the enemy!" The Emperor then addressed the 7th Light Infantry, nearly all composed of men of South Languedoc and of the Pyrenees, and said, "These are the best men of the army on a march; these are no stragglers, especially when the enemy is to be reached!" Then he added with a laugh, "To do you full justice I must add, you are the most noisy and pilfering rascals in the army!" "That is true, that is true," was the answer of the soldiers; every one of them had a duck, a fowl, or a goose in his knapsack; and it was necessary to put up with these abuses, for, as I have told you, once the armies of Napoleon were in the field they very seldom received distributions of provisions, and they lived on the country as they best could. There were, no doubt, grave inconveniences in this system, but it had one immense advantage, it enabled us to push forward unembarrassed by magazines and convoys; and this gave us a great superiority over our enemies, all whose movements depended on the baking or the arrival of stores of bread, or on the progress of herds of cattle, and so forth.'

This is Marbot's defence of a general system of marauding and rapine !

According to the author, a Saxon priest informed Napoleon of the path by which his troops scaled the Landgrafenberg heights, a position which assured him success at Jena. The energy and resource of Napoleon were most conspicuous on this occasion.

'A priest of Jena, who regarded the Prussians as enemies of his king and country, thought that he could supply Napoleon with the means of driving them from Saxony, and showed him a little path by which infantry could climb the steep sides of the Landgrafenberg. The Prussians had thought this way impassable, and had neglected to guard it. Napoleon thought otherwise, and, having received a report from his officers, went in person to the spot, accompanied by Marshal Lannes, and guided by the Saxon curé. The Emperor perceived that a little rocky plateau extended between the end of the path and the plain occupied by the enemy, and he resolved to concentrate part of his troops on this, so that they should issue, as from a citadel, to attack the Prussians. The undertaking would have been impossible for anyone but Napoleon in command of French troops.'

Marbot says that the Prussians fought ill at Jena, but in this he differs from most eyewitnesses, and notably from Napoleon himself, in the well-known bulletin that describes the battle.

'The Prussian infantry—I have already described how vicious was its composition—fought very badly, and the cavalry did no better. It often approached our battalions with loud shouts, but it was intimidated by their steady attitude, and never charged home. When it was within fifty paces of our lines it turned round, in a cowardly fashion, amidst volleys of musketry and the groans of our soldiers.'

It is doubtful whether it was a mistake of Napoleon, or the treachery of Bernadotte to a colleague, which exposed Davoust at Auerstadt to enormous odds. Marbot pronounces decisively against Bernadotte, who, however, was cordially disliked by him.

'Bernadotte, leaving Davoust to defend himself as he best could, moved along the Saale, and arrived at Dornburg. There was no enemy there; from the position he held he witnessed the terrible struggle in which the intrepid Davoust was engaged, and yet Bernadotte ordered his divisions to bivouac, and quietly to make their soup. It was in vain that the general officers around reproached him for his criminal inactivity; he would not stir an inch.'

These volumes contain a vivid account of the movements of the Grand Army after Jena—the most famous of Napoleon's conquering marches—of the complete demoralisation of the

routed Prussians, and of the sudden collapse of the Prussian monarchy. The centralised state of Frederick the Great, and a people under despotic rule, submitted without an attempt at resistance, a very different spectacle from the rising of Spain, and even of Portugal, a few months afterwards, and in marked contrast with the national defence of France in 1870-1, an heroic effort more nearly successful than cour-tiers of fortune will deign to allow. Marbot followed the army into the wastes of Poland, and took part in the operations which for the first time distinctly brought out an essential defect in Napoleon's system of conducting war. One of the secrets of the great captain's success—apart from his splendid and scientific genius—was that he had been able to move his troops with a celerity previously unknown in war, because, as we have seen in this book, and as has been noticed by many writers, he relied on resources found on the spot to procure supplies for his armies on the march, and also because he made a better use of roads and communications than any general of the day. This system accomplished marvellous results in rich countries like Italy and parts of Germany, as a rule traversed by fine highways; but it failed in Poland, in Portugal, and, above all, in Russia; and it is to the lasting honour of Wellington that he was the first to perceive its inherent weakness. Marbot clearly points out how the Grand Army, though never perhaps more skilfully led, was baffled in its pursuit of the Allies through the morasses and forests of barren Poland; and he regarded the country and its people with disgust.

'We saw the sun no more; snow and rain were constant; it became most difficult to procure food; there was no wine, scarcely any beer, and the little there was abominably bad; muddy water, no bread, and habitations to be fought for with pigs and cows. The soldiers used to exclaim: "Do the Poles consider this a native land?" The Emperor himself was disenchanted; he had come to restore Poland, and had hoped that the whole population of this great country would rise, to a man, at the approach of the French armies; but no one stirred.'

Marbot about this time accompanied Duroc on a mission to the King and Queen of Prussia—another proof of the esteem of his chief. He was soon afterwards promoted to the rank of captain—no promotion was ever more fairly earned—and he shared in the vicissitudes of the campaign of Eylau. Napoleon has been blamed for attacking the Russians before the arrival of Davoust and Ney, but the following passage shows that this was not his purpose; and the premature attack on Eylau seems to have been an accident:—

'I heard Napoleon say to Augereau: "It was suggested that I should attack Eylau this evening; but besides that I do not approve of engagements at night, I will not advance my centre too forward before the arrival of Davoust, my right wing, and of Ney, my left. I shall therefore await their arrival to-morrow upon this plateau, which, when crowned with guns, gives our infantry an excellent position; when Ney and Davoust shall have come into line, we shall all attack the enemy together."'

Eylau, like Borodino, was one of the most terrible and sanguinary battles of the Napoleonic age, and the corps of Augereau was almost destroyed. Marbot brilliantly describes one scene of a conflict in which he displayed rare courage and presence of mind; he was despatched by his chief to carry orders to a regiment surrounded by overwhelming numbers; two of his brother officers had perished in the attempt, but he succeeded mainly through his coolness and skill. The regiment, however, was unable to move, and a *chef de bataillon* committed its eagle to his care.

"I see no means of saving the regiment," said the *chef de bataillon*; "go back to the Emperor, bear him the farewell of the 14th of the 1st ne; it has faithfully carried out his orders; carry to him the eagle he gave us, which we can no longer defend; it would be too dreadful to die, and to see it fall into the hands of the enemy." The officer then gave me the eagle; the soldiers, glorious wrecks of this intrepid regiment, saluted it for the last time, with shouts of "Vive l'Empereur!"—they were dying for him. It was the "Cæsar, morituri te salutant" of Tacitus; but this cry was that of heroes.'

Marbot was nearly stunned to death by the wind of a round shot, which struck his helmet and just missed his head; he owed his life to the ferocity of a restive charger.

'A Russian grenadier, more furious than ever, struck at me again; but the blow made him stumble; his bayonet stabbed my mare in the thigh, and the animal, the pain exciting her ferocious temper, rushed at the Russian, and, at a single mouthful, tore away with her teeth his nose, his lips, his eyebrows, and the whole skin of his face—a living death's head, gushing blood. It was a horrible sight. Then, tearing furiously into the midst of the combatants, Lisette, raging and biting, overthrew everyone she encountered on her way. The Russian officer, who had so often tried to strike me, attempted to lay hold of her bridle; she seized him by the belly, bore him along, carried him out of the *mêlée*, to the bottom of a hillock, and there, having torn out his entrails, and crushed him under her hoofs, she left him dying in the snow. Returning back, she went off full gallop to the cemetery of Eylau. Thanks to my hussar saddle, I was able to keep my seat.'

Lisette fell after this violent effort, and her rider was
VOL. CLXXV. NO. CCCLIX.

saved by a mere accident, having been recognised by a faithful follower amidst a heap of the dying and the dead. He preserved, it would seem, his precious deposit; but he had been severely wounded, and he nearly died of gangrene, brought on by hardship and the effects of cold, and was sent off as an invalid to Paris. He was soon, however, placed on the staff of Launnes—the corps of Augereau had been disbanded—and we find him carrying despatches to and fro between the capital and Napoleon's tent at Finkenstein, where the Emperor made his immense preparations for the memorable campaign of the summer of 1807. Marbot was despatched by Lannes, on the morning of Friedland, to inform Napoleon of the attack of Benningsen; he thus describes how he met the Emperor:—

‘He placed me at his side, and as we galloped along he made me explain what had happened on the field of battle. Having done this, the Emperor smiled, and said to me: “Is your memory good?” “Pretty good, sire.” “Well, this is the 14th June. What anniversary is it?” “That of Marengo.” “Yes, yes,” replied the Emperor, “that of Marengo, and I shall beat the Russians, as I beat the Austrians.”’

The author gives us a good account of Friedland and of the celebrated scenes of Tilsit, but we have no space to quote from his narrative. He became soon afterwards an extra aide-de-camp of Murat—times had changed since the chief of the Imperial cavalry had run messages for Madame de Marbot—and he was in the Spanish Peninsula in the first months of 1808. Marbot describes, with the indignation of an honest man, the means employed by Napoleon to obtain by fraud the double thrones of Portugal and Spain—compared by Talleyrand to cheating at cards; but we pass from these well-known events of history. He was sent by Murat to save the life of Godey, after the revolution of Aranjuez, and he fulfilled this mission with courage and tact. He also witnessed the universal rising at Madrid, and gives us this sketch of one of the scenes of the massacre of the population by Murat's soldiers:—

‘At the sight of the mamelukes, though they greatly feared them, the Spaniards attempted to make a stand; but their resolution did not last long; the appearance of the Turks terrified the bravest hearts. The mamelukes, charging the mass of human beings, scimitar in hand, made a hundred heads fly in a moment, and opened a path for the chasseurs of the Guard, and for the division of dragoons, which furiously plied its sabres.’

Murat despatched Marbot to convey to Napoleon the in-

telligence of the revolt of Madrid, a dangerous service in an insurgent country. Marbot found the Emperor at the chateau of Marsac, an historic edifice not far from Bayonne; the whole royal family of Spain had by this time gone, of its own accord, into the tempter's toils—weak things fascinated by the rattlesnake's spell. The interview was one of no common interest; it proves how Napoleon had deceived himself as to the real character of events in Spain.

'Napoleon called me aside, and, walking into a secluded path, asked me many questions about the combat at Madrid. I could easily see that he shared Murat's opinion, and believed that the success of the 2nd of May would put an end to resistance in Spain. I thought differently; and had Napoleon asked for my views, I should have deemed it dishonourable to conceal them; but it was for me only respectfully to answer the Emperor's questions, and I could only make him aware of my gloomy forebodings in an indirect way. I told him of the revolt at Madrid, but painted in the most vivid colours the desperation of the citizens, when they had learned that the royal family, still in Spain, were to be conducted into France; the ferocious courage of the population, nay, even of the women, in the combat; and the dark and threatening demeanour of the inhabitants of Madrid after our victory. I was perhaps on the point of revealing my real opinion, when Napoleon cut me short, and exclaimed, "Bah, bah! they will settle down, and will bless me, when they shall behold their country emerge from the disgrace and the disorder of the weakest and most corrupt administration that has ever been seen."'

We pass over Baylen and Vimeiro, great events in the fortunes of the French Empire, but only referred to in these volumes. After Murat had quitted Spain to assume the crown of Naples, Marbot, who had refused to leave the eagles, became once more an aide-de-camp of Lannes, and through the interposition of Augereau he received the cross of the Legion of Honour from Napoleon's hands, for his admirable valour and resource at Eylau, the distinction, owing to a mistake of Berthier, having been given before to his brother. The magical spell of Napoleon's influence—one of the supreme gifts of the great captain—is well seen in the following passage:—

'The Emperor, having had a few words with Berthier, approached me, spoke kindly, and taking the cross of one of his orderly officers, placed it on my breast. It was the 29th of October, 1808. The day was one of the happiest of my life, for at that time the Legion of Honour had not been made common, and a value was attached to it which, unhappily, it has since lost. To be decorated at twenty-six years of age! I could hardly contain myself, such was my joy. The satisfaction of the kind-hearted marshal was not less than mine; and he conducted me to my mother that she might share it. To make my

delight complete, Duroc, the marshal of the palace, sent for the helmet struck by a cannon-ball at the battle of Eylau—Napoleon had expressed a wish to see it.'

Among Marbot's comrades was Labédoyère, one of the ill-fated victims of 1815, and fit to stand beside Ney in life as in death. Lannes and his staff took part in the great invasion of Spain at the close of 1808, conducted by Napoleon in person, and his corps easily scattered the Spanish levies at Tudela—a day that appeared decisive. The marshal despatched Marbot to inform the Emperor of the victory, across a difficult country infested with the ever present guerrillas, and his aide-de-camp expected the promotion he deserved. Marbot, however, was attacked, and severely wounded in a skirmish with a body of Spanish soldiers, and an accident only saved his life. He was ere long with Napoleon and the main army, and he witnessed the famous charge of the Polish lancers which carried the Somo Sierra heights. The Poles, the author tells us, had not been regularly trained, and their success was due to the skill of Montbrun, one of the most brilliant of cavalry officers, who met a soldier's death at the Moskova.

'Montbrun was a very fine man, of the same style as Murat; tall, scarred, black-bearded, a real military figure, and an excellent horseman. He pleased the Poles, and these having promised to conform to his directions, Montbrun arrayed his squadrons, leaving a proper space between each, and having made the requisite arrangements, boldly placed himself at their head. He rushes into the denile; some squadrons were shaken by the musketry; but there was no serious disorder, for the different parts of the column were sufficiently divided, and the top of the mountain is at last attained. Montbrun dismounts, and hastens the first to the entrenchments to tear away the palisades, under a heavy fire. The Poles follow his example; the entrenchments are stormed; the regiment charges the Spaniards, and they are cut to pieces.'

Marbot followed Napoleon across the Guadarrama, in the fierce effort made by the Emperor to crush Moore and his army in retreat. The passage of the range in a wintry tempest was a remarkable feat of daring and energy; but Napoleon's correspondence shows how intense was his eagerness to overtake the British troops, to be met by him on one other occasion in front of Waterloo. Marbot gives us this account of the perilous march; it may be added that M. de Gonneville, who was present with a detachment of the corps of Ney, informs us that the soldiers of one division suffered such hardships, and were in such a muti-

nous temper, that they threatened to take the life of the Emperor.

‘Anyone but Napoleon would have halted ; but he wished to come up with the English at any risk ; he addressed the soldiers, and ordered each platoon to march arm in arm, so as not to be swept away by the storm. The cavalry were to dismount, and advance in the same way ; and, to set an example, the Emperor formed his staff into several platoons, and placed himself between Lannes and Duroc, the staff keeping line arms linked in arms. At the word of command given by Napoleon in person, the column moved forward, and ascended the mountain, in spite of the violent wind which drove us back, of the snow which smote our faces, and of the slippery snowdrifts, which made us stumble at every step. I suffered greatly during four mortal hours in the ascent. When we had got halfway up, the marshals and generals, who wore heavy jack boots, could go no further. Napoleon was then lifted upon a gun, and sat astraddle on it ; the marshals and generals did the same ; we proceeded in this grotesque fashion ; and at last we reached the convent on the summit of the great hill.’

Napoleon was baffled in his pursuit, his presence in France having become necessary by the preparations of Austria for war. Marbot took part in the siege of Saragossa, and has given us a vivid account of it. As was often his fortune, he was severely wounded. With a delicate and chivalrous sense of honour, he consented to abandon his claim for promotion in favour of a deserving comrade, and he accompanied Lannes, with the grade of a captain only, in the memorable campaign of 1809, the last of his illustrious chief. His services in this contest were very striking, and show some of the highest qualities of a distinguished soldier. He shared in the glories of Abensberg and Eckmühl, operations declared by Napoleon himself to have been the finest of his extraordinary career, and illustrating how a great commander can pluck safety and victory out of extreme danger. Marbot directed the assault of the breach at Ratisbon, and was successful owing to his rare skill and insight, two forlorn hopes having been utterly destroyed. Labédoyère was his chief companion. We transcribe a passage which describes a scene very characteristic of the Grand Army :—

‘The marshal vainly repeated his appeal to the bravest men of Morand’s division ; vainly he reminded them that the Emperor and the army were looking on ; he was answered only by gloomy silence, for everyone was convinced that it would be certain death to pass the walls of the barn under the enemy’s fire. Lannes, a hero, then exclaimed, “Well, I will show you that I was a grenadier before I became a marshal, and am so still.” He seizes a ladder, carries it along and tries to place it at the breach. His aides-de-camp tried to prevent

him, but he resists and becomes angry. I then took the liberty of saying, "M. le Maréchal, you would not wish that we should all be dishonoured, and we should be were you to receive even the slightest wound in carrying a scaling ladder to the rampart, before every one of your aides-de-camp was slain." In spite of his efforts, I pulled the ladder away, and placed it on my shoulder, while De Very took the other end, and our comrades, falling into pairs, took hold of other ladders."

The staff of Lannes formed the head of the assaulting column; Marbot, a true leader, took the command; and, by scattering the assailants in loose order, and taking care to have the scaling ladders ready, he performed a feat that was almost miraculous.

'I gave my directions, and took care they should be understood; Marshal Lannes approved, and cried out, "Go, then, my brave lads, and Ratisbon is stormed." At this signal De Very and myself rushed forward, sped across the terrace, and thrust our ladders into the ditch and descended. Our comrades followed, with fifty grenadiers behind. In vain the cannon of the fortress are discharged, in vain the musketry rolls, and shells and balls strike the trees and the walls; it is very difficult to aim at people near a fort, going at great speed, and separated at distances of twenty paces. We reached the ditch, and not one man of the little column was hurt. The scaling ladders, arranged in order beforehand, were carried to the top of the fallen house; we placed them against the parapet, and we rushed forward to the rampart. I climbed up, at the head of the attacking party, on one of the first ladders; Labédoyère . . . asked me to lend him a hand, and at last we attain the top of the rampart.'

Napoleon was wounded before Ratisbon; on this occasion he established the usage of giving pensions to private soldiers, and conferring on them a special title if they were thought worthy of the cross of the Legion. Marbot describes how a *vieux moustache* accosted the Emperor. Napoleon encouraged this kind of freedom, and it strengthened his extraordinary power over the hearts of his troops, though it would have been mischievous in the case of any other chief.

'An old grenadier who had served in the campaigns of Italy and Egypt, not hearing his name called, asked for the cross in a phlegmatic tone. "Well, but," said Napoleon, "what have you done to deserve this honour?" "Sire, I gave you a water melon in the desert of Jaffa, under a burning sun." "I thank you again, but a gift like that has no claim to the cross of the Legion of Honour." Upon this the grenadier, hitherto as cold as ice, excited himself almost into a fit, and cried out violently, "What! you reckon as nothing seven wounds received on the bridge of Arcola, at Lodi, at Castiglione, at the Pyramids, at St. Jean of Acre, at Austerlitz, at Friedland, eleven

campaigns in Italy, in Egypt, in Austria, in Poland, in——” The Emperor cut him short, and, laughingly imitating his rapid language, exclaimed, “Ta, ta, ta, what a passion you are in! you have come to the essential points. You ought to have begun with them; they are worth much more than the melon. I make you Chevalier de l’Empire with a pension of 1,200 francs; are you satisfied?” “But, sire, I would rather have the cross.” “You have both one and the other, because I have made you a chevalier.” The brave grenadier would not give up, and there was much trouble in making him understand that the title of Chevalier de l’Empire carried with it the title of Chevalier of the Legion of Honour.’

Marbot’s presence of mind was again seen in his attempt to find a way to the bridge on the Danube in the retreat of the Archduke Charles from Ratisbon.

“All of a sudden a door opens, and a young woman, pale, and with haggard eyes, makes towards us, and cries out, “I am French, save me!” It was a Parisian milliner. . . . A bright idea came into my head, and I thought we might turn this meeting to account. “You know where the bridge is?” I said. “Certainly.” “Well, show us the way.” “Good heavens! in the midst of this fire? I am dying of fright, and I came to ask you to let me have some soldiers to defend my house.” “I am very sorry, but you will not go back until you show us the bridge. Let two grenadiers take the lady by the arm, and place her at the head of the column!””

Like all commentators on the campaign of 1809, Marbot condemns Masséna’s attack on Ebersberg in the advance from Ratisbon on Vienna.

‘Had anyone but Masséna made so thoughtless an attack without orders, he would probably have been sent to the rear; but it was Masséna, the spoiled child of a victory, and the Emperor only made some severe remarks.’

On arrival at Molk, after the passage of the Enns, Marbot performed a feat which he has justly described as the most perilous of his military career. Napoleon could not discover whether the corps of Hiller barred the way to Vienna or had crossed the Danube, joining the Archduke on the northern bank; and it was difficult in the extreme to ascertain the fact. The Emperor was at the convent of Molk, a Benedictine house of historic renown; and, in a conversation with Lannes, he proposed to send an officer across the great river, though the enterprise was almost certain death. Lannes named Marbot, and this interview took place:—

‘Napoleon, Marshal Lannes, and I were alone together on the balcony, and the marshal said to me, “An Austrian camp is on the other side of the Danube; the Emperor particularly wishes to know whether the corps of Hiller is there, or whether it is still on this bank. To find

this out a brave man is needed, who will dare to cross the Danube and to capture an enemy's soldier or two ; and I have reported that you were the man.' Napoleon then remarked, "I give you no orders, observe that ; but I express a desire ; I recognise that the enterprise is extremely dangerous, and you will not displease me if you refuse. Go into the next room, and tell us frankly your decision."

Marbot accepted proudly the perilous quest, though fully aware of its enormous risks.

"I will go, sire ! I will go ! and if I perish I bequeath my mother to your Majesty." The Emperor took my ear—his well-known mark of satisfaction—and the marshal gave me his hand, exclaiming, "I was right when I told your Majesty he would go. That is what I call a brave soldier !"

Six grenadiers of the Old Guard embarked with Marbot on the Danube at night, a crew to man their boat having been found partly through persuasion and partly by force. The river was rolling great angry waves, and was more than two miles broad at this spot ; but the real danger lay in the masses of pine borne down the current, and certain to crush a much larger craft if they came in contact with it. Fortune, however, in this instance favoured the brave, and Marbot, guiding his men with great intelligence, reached the southern shore, and captured three Austrian soldiers.

'As soon as the Austrian stooped down to fill his can, my corporal and two grenadiers seize him by the throat, cram a handkerchief full of sand into his mouth, and, pointing with their sabres, threaten to kill him if he made the slightest resistance or uttered a cry. The man, astounded, obeyed, and was carried into the boat. . . . I was pretty well satisfied with this capture ; but I perceived two soldiers on the top of the bank, each carrying the end of a piece of wood, on which a large camp-kettle hung. These men were only a few paces off, and we could not re-embark without being seen. I made a sign to my grenadiers to hide themselves, and when the two Austrians stooped to fill the vessel they were seized by the back by vigorous arms, and plunged into the water lest they should ply their sabres.'

The return passage was not less critical, but Marbot reached Molk, was received by the Emperor, and from the report of the captured Austrians convinced Napoleon that Hiller was beyond the Danube.

'Lannes came forward, embraced me cordially, and, leading me to the Emperor's apartments, cried out, "Here he is, sire, I well knew he would return ; he has brought three prisoners of the corps of General Hiller." Napoleon received me as graciously as possible ; and, though I was wet and muddy all over, put his hand upon my shoulder, and did not forget the great sign of his satisfaction—pinching my ear. You may imagine how I was questioned ! The Emperor

insisted on knowing in detail all that happened in my dangerous expedition, and when I had finished my story said, "I am pleased with the Chef d'Escadron Marbot." These words were equivalent to a brevet, and filled me with delight. A chamberlain at this moment announced that the Emperor was served; I expected to wait in the corridor until he had left the table, but Napoleon, pointing to the dining-room door, said, "You will breakfast with me." I was deeply touched, for such an honour had never before been conferred on an officer of my grade.'

The grenadiers of the Guard were grandly recompensed, and the crew, and even the prisoners, were amply rewarded. Napoleon on these occasions always showed well.

'Directing the brave corporal and the five soldiers to approach, he placed the cross of the Legion of Honour on their breasts, made them Chevaliers de l'Empire, and gave each of them a pension of 1,200 francs. The old moustaches wept with joy! Then came the turn of the crew . . . instead of 6,000 francs, which had been promised, they received 12,000 each. . . . Napoleon took a rouleau of 1,000 francs out of his bureau, gave them to the prisoner who was a servant, and several pieces of gold to the other two prisoners.'

Weeks were yet to pass before Marbot attained the grade promised by the Emperor with every mark of honour. He advanced to Vienna with the Grand Army, and gives an account of the rupture of the bridge at Lobau, somewhat different from that of most historians.

'An Austrian officer, employed in watching, with some companies of chasseurs, the islands above Aspern, had embarked in a little boat, and then had rowed into the middle of the river to see our troops cross the bridges at a distance. He beheld the first breach in them, caused by trees borne down by the current; and this suggested to him the idea of making these accidents occur again, according as we endeavoured to prevent them. He directed a great number of beams, and several boats laden with combustibles, to be launched into the stream; these destroyed some pontoons, but as our men replaced them quickly, the officer had an enormous floating mill set on fire, brought it into the midst of the Danube, and sent it down upon the great bridge, which it broke and carried away in part.'

At Essling, Lannes met a soldier's death, but just before that melancholy event he had had a bitter quarrel with Bessières, placed by Napoleon under the marshal's orders. From the day of Roncesvalles to that of Waterloo this has been a common fault of the warriors of France, and she has paid heavily for it in many defeats. Bazaine—to refer to one of the last instances—was jealous of Macmahon in 1870, and this jealousy had something to do with the catastrophe of Sedan. Masséna interfered between the

angry chiefs, who were on the point of fighting a duel—conduct, we venture to say, that has never been heard of in the Austrian, the British, or the German service.

‘During these passages the veteran Masséna interfered between the adversaries, and tried to calm them; at last, as he did not succeed, he took a high hand in his turn: “I am your senior officer, gentlemen. You are in my camp, and I will not allow you to present to the troops the scandalous sight of two marshals fighting in face of the enemy. I desire you, in the name of the Emperor, to separate at once.”’

Marbot watched by the deathbed of his chief, and distinctly contradicts the untrue statement that Lannes addressed words of reproach to Napoleon.

‘The marshal was very sensible of the marks of regard bestowed on him by the Emperor; and when Napoleon was obliged to go, in order to give directions for the safety of the army, he said, as he was leaving, “You will live, my friend, you will live.” The marshal took his hands, and answered, “I wish it, if I can yet be of use to France and your Majesty.”’

These volumes contain an excellent account of the passage of the Danube from the entrenched camp of Lobau—one of the finest operations ever seen in war—and of the great, but hardly decisive, battle of Wagram; but these scenes will be found in any good history. Marbot has accurately described the superiority of Napoleon’s tactics upon the field; he held the position of Benedek of Sadowa, but with advantages certainly less. We need hardly say he was not a Benedek.

‘Napoleon held a central position, and this enabled him to keep a large part of his troops in reserve, and not to resist the enemy at every point. On the other hand, the Archduke Charles had been obliged greatly to disseminate his army, in order to execute an eccentric movement: he hoped to surround us, but he was nowhere in sufficient force.’

Bernadotte, as is well known, was disgraced at Wagram; he had sneered at Napoleon’s admirable moves, and his contingent of Saxons took to flight.

‘He found himself face to face with the Emperor, who said in an ironical voice, “So that is the skilful manœuvre on which you relied to make the Archduke lay down his arms! . . . I deprive you, sir, of your command. You direct your corps d’armée too ill. Quit the field at once, and the Grand Army within twenty-four hours; I will have nothing to do with a troublesome fool like you.”’

Marbot had been placed on Masséna’s staff after the death of Lannes, and was made a *chef d’escadron* at last, promotion long withheld by a series of accidents. He had previously

refused the same grade in the Imperial Guard, a much higher position, on account of the dispute between Lannes and Bessières, the commander of the horse of that renowned corps. The parsimony of Masséna is well known—he was, in fact, an Italian Jew—and Marbot ere long had displeased his chief by advising him to give sufficient pensions to the servants who had driven his calèche at Wagram when disabled, from a fall, to mount on horseback.

‘A tigress whose young had been attacked by an imprudent hunter had not a more fierce aspect than Masséna had when he heard me speak in this way: he bounded from his armchair, and exclaimed, “What, you luckless fellow, you wish to ruin me! What! 400 francs a year for life! No, no. I will give 400 francs once for all.”’

The emoluments of Masséna at this time were not much short of 40,000*l.* a year; and though Napoleon had often made him disgorge, he had amassed hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Marbot was wounded again before the armistice of Znaïm, in endeavouring to check the fire of the hostile outposts. He served in 1810–11 in the campaign of Portugal, being attached to Masséna’s staff, and his *Memoirs* have here particular interest. On the whole he confirms Napoleon’s view that Masséna committed grave mistakes in his advance from Almeida to Torres Vedras, and he agrees with many of Napoleon’s conclusions; but he has certainly fallen into some plain errors. The most valuable part, however, of these chapters is the information they afford on the secret causes of the dissensions between the French commanders, which contributed to Masséna’s reverses; and Marbot, it should be added, has done justice to the great qualities shown by his chief when struggling against the tide of ill fortune, his distinctive excellence throughout his career. Napoleon’s portrait of Masséna is well known, and not unworthy of the hand of Tacitus. We place by it Marbot’s vivid sketch, taken from the last of these delightful volumes, which has reached us as we were writing these pages:—

‘Masséna was thin and somewhat shrivelled; in stature he was below the middle size. His Italian countenance was full of expression. Dissimulation, malevolence, hardness, and avarice formed the bad sides of his character. He had great natural intelligence, but his youth of adventure, and the humble position of his family, had not given him the means of study, and he was extremely uneducated. Nature had made him a general, and courage and tenacity did the rest. In the bright days of his military career, his *coup d’œil* was accurate, his decision prompt, and he never allowed himself to be cast down by ill for-

tune. As age advanced, his circumspection almost became timidity; he was so afraid to endanger the high reputation he had acquired. He hated reading; he had no notion of what has been written on war; he made war by inspiration; and Napoleon judged him rightly when, describing him in his *Memoirs*, the Emperor said that "Masséna used to come on the field of battle without an idea of what was to be done; circumstances decided his conduct."

The campaign began under bad auspices; Masséna's energy had declined, Ney and Junot were unwilling lieutenants, and an accident at the outset turned them against their chief. M. Thiers has lifted part of the veil thrown over this passage of Masséna's life, but these *Memoirs* completely remove it, and it really appears as if a mistress who accompanied the marshal in the campaign had not a little to do with the first failures of the French. Madame X. set Ney, Junot, and her protector by the ears, having previously given offence to the Duchesse d'Abrantès.

'Masséna said aloud to Ney, "My dear marshal, give Madame your arm!" Marshal Ney turned pale, and was on the point of speaking out. Still, he kept quiet, and led Madame X. to the table, giving her a finger only. At a sign from Masséna, she sat on his right. During the whole of dinner Ney did not say a word to her, and spoke to Montbrun, his neighbour on the left. Madame X., who was too intelligent not to perceive how false her position was, was seized with a sudden nervous attack, and fell down in a faint. Ney, Reynier, Montbrun, and Junot left the garden, and Ney spoke out his sentiments. . . . After this day Ney, Reynier, Montbrun, and Junot were on the worst of terms with Masséna; and he reciprocated their dislike.'

Masséna, military writers agree, invaded Portugal by a wrong line, and this, Marbot says, was mainly the fault of Pelet, the marshal's chief adviser, who had replaced Saint-Croix, a really great soldier. His delays, however, made the effects of a false movement worse, and these were caused, to some extent at least, by his solicitude for his frail companion.

'Military men of all services have been unable to comprehend the inaction of Masséna for nearly a week at Viseu, but the staff of the marshal can prove that the fatigue of Madame X. delayed Masséna a good deal, and kept him fixed to the place, for it would have been impossible to leave her behind in an insurgent country, without the risk of her being carried away. Besides, when he had resolved to set off, Masséna went by very easy stages; he stopped at Trudella, and next day, the 26th of September, he placed his head-quarters at Mortagna, on the right bank of a stream called the Criz; but he had lost precious time in finding a suitable house for Madame X.; and it

was two o'clock in the afternoon before he set off, with his staff, for the outposts, five long leagues off, at the foot of the Sierra Alcoba.'

Marbot positively asserts that with another aide-de-camp he discovered the mountain road by Boialva, which would have enabled the French to turn Wellington's left, and would have made the disastrous attack of Busaco needless. He declares that Masséna sent them upon this errand, approved of the movement they proposed, and fought Busaco against his better judgement.

'On finding himself in front of the position, which he had hardly examined the day before, Masséna appeared to hesitate, and coming near the spot where I was talking to General Fririon, said sadly, "Your advice of yesterday was good." These few words raised the hopes we had entertained, and we redoubled our efforts to induce the general-in-chief to turn the sierra at its extreme left by Boialva. We had already brought him round, when Marshal Ney, General Reynier, and Pelet interrupted our conversation, and said that everything was ready for the attack. Masséna made some remarks; but, yielding to the influence of his lieutenants, and no doubt fearing that he would incur the reproach of missing a victory announced by them as certain, he ordered fire to open at about seven in the morning.'

The author does justice to the skill of Wellington and to the British infantry tactics at Busaco, a battle which, perhaps, involved the fortunes of Europe, for had our army suffered defeat, it would have been recalled by the ministry at home, and the Continent must have fallen under the yoke of Napoleon.

'Our brave soldiers reached the crest of the mountain, and while they were breathless found themselves in front of a line of English infantry, which they had not yet seen. This line smote them, at fifteen paces' distance, with a well-aimed and well-sustained fire, which struck down about 300 men; and it then charged with the bayonet. This unexpected attack, accompanied by volleys of grape shot directed against their flanks, shook some of our battalions; but they quickly recovered themselves. . . . Wellington, however, had ordered a strong reserve to advance while our troops were at the foot of the mountain. The French, pressed on all sides, and forced to abandon the narrow space which they occupied on the plateau, after a long and gallant resistance, were driven in a mass down the steep descent which they had climbed.'

The battle ended in the complete defeat of the French, and Masséna seems to have felt he had himself to blame.

'On the 28th, at daybreak, the echoes of Alcoba sent forth loud shouts of exultation, and the sounds of the English bands belonging to the army ranged on the heights. Wellington was holding a review of

his troops ; and they saluted him with vociferous cheers. At the foot of the sierra the French maintained a sad silence. Masséna ought to have mounted his horse, to have reviewed his army, to have harangued his soldiers ; the revived ardour of these would have answered by acclamations—earnest of future victories—the vexatious challenge of the enemy. The Emperor and Marshal Lannes certainly would have done this ; but Masséna kept apart, walking alone, with a look of indecision, and giving no orders. His lieutenants, Ney and Reynier, openly blamed him for the imprudence of attacking a position so strong as that of Busaco, the very men who, the day before, had urged him to give battle, saying they would answer for a victory !

Marbot censures Wellington for allowing the road by Boialva to be ill guarded—Masséna turned the Duke's left even after Busaco—but this reproach seems to be not deserved. He is furious, too, with Trent for what he has described as the massacre at Coimbra of French prisoners, but Napier has fairly refuted this charge. Marbot seems more justly to blame Masséna for not pressing Wellington's retreat before the lines of Torres Vedras were reached ; but the marshal was necessarily delayed some days at Coimbra, and he was not aware of the existence of the lines. Strategically, too, the advance from Coimbra—and in this Napoleon and the Duke agreed—was an operation that cannot be justified, tempting as the occasion was to attack Wellington. The Emperor has compared it to the march of Charles XII. on Pultowa :—

‘ Masséna had a great opportunity. He ought to have pushed forward the 8th corps in pursuit of the enemy, the corps of Junot, which, not having fought at Busaco, was perfectly ready, and could have inflicted heavy losses on the English army by a rapid attack. Many of our soldiers, prisoners of Busaco, who had escaped, declared that that army was in a state of complete disorder. But to our great astonishment the French commander-in-chief, as though he wished to give the enemy time to recover, and to draw off, ordered the pursuit to be suspended, put his army in cantonments in Coimbra and the neighbouring villages, and stayed there three whole days.’

In the second week of October 1810 the French army was spread before the famous lines, where Wellington, in Napier's expressive phrase, ‘ had deposited, as in a citadel, the independence of Portugal,’ and perhaps of Europe. The author of these volumes concurs in the surprise felt by everyone who has studied the subject, that the existence of the lines was wholly unknown to the French commanders, and even to the Emperor.

‘ Neither Marshal Ney, who had been for a year at Salamanca, nor Masséna, who had been making arrangements during six months to

invade Portugal, had the least notion about these gigantic entrenchments. Generals Reynier and Junot were in the same state of ignorance; but most astonishing of all, and a thing that would be incredible were not the facts well known by this time, even the French Government was not aware that the mountains of Cintra were fortified. One cannot understand why the Emperor, whose agents made their way everywhere, did not send some to Lisbon.'

Masséna sent Marbot and M. de Ligniville, the discoverers of the road by Boialva, to reconnoitre and report on the lines, and to ascertain if they could be attacked. Marbot insists that they might have been forced, but he is the only soldier who has ever said so, and the assertion is a complete mistake. He saw only the first of the triple range of defences, and Wellington was greatly superior in force. There can hardly be a doubt that it would have been a vain enterprise to attempt to carry the lines in front.

'The history of the wars of the age of Louis XIV., an epoch when great use was made of defensive lines, proves that, when attacked, these were, as a rule, carried, because the defenders could not give each other sufficient assistance. We believe that it would not have been difficult to pierce the English lines at some point of their immense extension. An entrance having been once made, the enemy's troops, placed at several leagues, and even at a day's march, from the spot, would have seen that they could not come up in time, except in very inferior force, and would have fallen back, not on Lisbon, whence transports cannot sail at all winds, but upon Cascaes, where their military fleet and ships were collected. The retreat of the enemy would have been very difficult, and might have become a rout; but, in any event, the embarkation of the British army before us would have cost it dear; it would have been a second edition of that of Sir John Moore at Corunna.'

The dissensions among the French generals, which had never ceased since the beginning of the campaign, now broke out into an open rupture.

'When my comrade and myself had made our report to Masséna, the eyes of the old warrior sparkled with a noble fire, and he dictated on the spot the orders for the advance, arranging the attack which he intended to make on the following day. On receiving their orders the four lieutenants of the general-in-chief went in haste to see him, and the meeting was a most stormy one. General Junot, who was perfectly acquainted with Lisbon, where he had been in command, declared that it would be impossible to defend so vast a city, and pronounced decidedly for attacking. General Montbrun was of the same opinion; but Marshal Ney and General Reynier hotly opposed it, adding that, as the losses incurred at Busaco, together with those of the wounded at Coimbra, and the number of the sick disabled from scurvy, through the effects of the bad weather, had greatly diminished

the strength of the army, it would be impossible to attack Cintra and its strong positions. Their soldiers, they said too, were demoralised—an inaccurate statement, for the troops, on the contrary, were full of ardour, and had demanded to march on Lisbon. Masséna, vexed at this discussion, repeated himself the written orders of march; but Marshal Ney distinctly said that he would not carry them out. . . . Masséna, who would have been kept to his purpose by the energetic counsels of Saint-Croix, gave way owing to the disobedience of his two chief lieutenants.'

Up to this point Masséna had made many mistakes, and had even given proofs of indecision and weakness. But the great powers which have justly made him renowned re-appeared in the presence of adverse fortune, and thenceforward his conduct was not unworthy of the warrior of Genoa and even of Zürich. He held Wellington for months in check by his admirable choice of the position of Santarem. He abandoned his ground only when the surrounding country had been turned into a wasted desert, and his retreat from Portugal was a model of skill. Marbot describes these passages of the campaign at length, but he adds little to a well-known tale. We shall merely remark that Madame X., the unfortunate cause of disastrous quarrels, seems to have held a small place in Masséna's thoughts when he was brought face to face with the frowns of fortune. Soon after the veteran had dismissed Ney—his insubordination had been unbearable—and had been left by Napoleon to his own resources—one of the greatest mistakes of the Emperor's life—the fine offensive return he made very nearly changed the results of the campaign, and he only missed victory at Fuentes d'Onoro through the faults and jealousies of inferior men. The Duke was never, perhaps, in such danger in the Peninsula as on this great occasion; indeed, he had the candour to allow that 'had Boney been in command' he must have been defeated when his right had been turned. Masséna was twice baffled by the refusal of Bessières to give assistance to a comrade he disliked, one of the most striking instances which appear in history of a common failing of French commanders.

'Masséna, eager to complete his victory, sends an aide-de-camp to direct General Lepic, in reserve with the cavalry of the Guard, to charge. Lepic, a brave soldier, biting with indignation the blade of his sabre, sadly replies that Marshal Bessières, his immediate chief, has positively ordered him not to allow the Guard to engage without his orders. The aides-de-camp hurry off in every direction to find out Bessières; but the marshal, who during several days had been constantly at Masséna's side, had disappeared—not from want of courage, for he

was very brave, but from jealousy of a comrade and of set purpose. . . .'

Bessières played the same bad and ignoble part in another and critical phase of the battle.

'There was a want of cartridges. Masséna, having no means of transport, begs Marshal Bessières to lend him, for a few hours, the caissons of the Guard; but Bessières coldly replied that his wagons, their drivers being already worn out, would be lost if a march were made, at night, by bad roads, and that he would not lend them until next day. Masséna loses his temper, exclaims that victory is snatched from him for the second time, and that this is well worth a few horses. Bessières continues to refuse, and a scene of extreme violence takes place between the two marshals.'

But we must desist for the present, and leave the conclusion of Marbot's eventful career in Russia, at Leipzig, and at Waterloo to another article.

ART. VI.—1. *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England.* Edited by Sir HARRIS NICOLAS. Published under the direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records. 7 vols. 1834-37.

2. *Acts of the Privy Council of England.* Edited by JOHN ROCHE DASENT. Published by direction of the Lord President of the Council and the Master of the Rolls. 3 vols. 1890-91.

MORE than fifty years ago the Commissioners on the Public Records of the Kingdom entrusted to the late Sir Harris Nicolas the task of making accessible to the historical student the manuscript records of the Privy Council. Sir Harris, with the laudable intention of making his work as complete as was possible, was not satisfied to publish only the series of authentic registers preserved in the Council Office, but most industriously extracted from the vast mass of manuscript wealth which has come into the possession of the trustees of the British Museum any documents which could be in any way described as referring to proceedings or ordinances of the Privy Council. Thus petitions to the king, instructions to ambassadors, memoranda, grants and assignments, and, indeed, all the various documents required in all ages for the administration of government, whether original and contemporary or only transcripts made at a later date, were included by Sir Harris. Nicolas within the scope of his undertaking, the result.

being that of the seven volumes first named at the head of this article no less than six are occupied with matter such as is described above, and it is not until he reaches his seventh volume that the editor gives us a reproduction of the actual Register of the Privy Council. We cannot now, however, regret that Sir Harris's prelude was so long drawn out, as it is not impossible that but for his laborious industry we should not even now have known how great are the historical treasures accumulated in the Manuscript department of the British Museum. It is true that, as Sir Harris himself points out in the preface to the first volume, these documents could not be accepted as legal evidence in a court of law, as there is no absolute proof of the authenticity even of those which appear to be original documents, whilst the more modern transcripts, of which the originals are lost, lie under even greater suspicion; but on this point the editor has made the following pertinent remarks:—

‘The principle which prevents those records from being legal evidence, solely because they have been alienated from their original and proper depositions, is most injurious to the establishment of truth, even if it be not in many cases repugnant to common sense. It is, in fact, to make truth dependant, not upon the unimpeachable character of the proof, but upon its accidental locality; and it is only one degree less absurd than if a man's testimony were to be refused solely because he did not reside in a particular habitation.

‘These remarks apply equally to the numerous original letters and ancient charters in the British Museum and other public libraries, the genuineness of which cannot for a moment be suspected; and it is confidently submitted that in the present advanced state of palaeographical knowledge, the rule of law which requires that every document shall be brought from the proper custody might, with perfect safety, be so far relaxed as to allow of such documents as charters, original letters, original heralds' visitations, chartularies, and all other ancient records and manuscripts which are contemporary with the periods to which they relate, being received in evidence, subject to whatever objections might arise as to their authenticity, and making their admission or rejection depend upon the credit to which, after a careful examination of their history, nature, and appearance, they might appear to be entitled. Such documents as were not brought from the proper legal custody would be viewed with more suspicion than if they came from the public archives, and would perhaps require the opinion of competent judges in support of their authenticity.

‘The propriety of directing attention to the rule of law which deprives these and similar important muniments of their value as legal evidence, and still more the application of that rule, with the same injurious result, to the early records of the Privy Council, will justify, it is hoped, these remarks upon the subject.’ (Vol. v. p. vi.)

This suggestion of Sir Harris Nicolas would seem, however, to point to the introduction of the most treacherous form of testimony known to modern lawyers—that of experts in the witness box; and, without altogether accepting the position he has taken up, we may, it is submitted, accept as genuine, without absolute legal proof, such documents as those which Sir Harris has reprinted as originals from the Cottonian Library, though later transcripts, such as many of those in the Harleian collection, must be received with greater suspicion, not as being possible forgeries, but on the ground of the inaccuracy of the transcriber. It cannot, however, be pretended that the same impress of authenticity is attached to any of these documents as that which belongs to the series of manuscripts which have been preserved in the archives of the Council Office since the latter years of the reign of Henry VIII.

Of all the sources from which Sir Harris drew his materials, the most important, no doubt, is the so-called Book of the Council of the reigns of Henry V. and Henry VI., but, unfortunately, this is only a fragment extending over a period of fourteen years—from 1421 to 1435—although, with the help of the other sources to which reference has been made, the record has been expanded over a portion of vol. ii. and all of vols. iii. and iv. This document cannot be better described than in the editor's own words:—

'The "Book of the Council," or general incorporation of the Minutes of its proceedings in a Register, commences with Trinity Term in this year, and the first entry is on July 1, 9 Hen. V., 1421. Every act of the Council, of which many are still extant, was written on a separate paper, and signed by all the members present, excepting the officers. These documents were afterwards copied into the General Register, or Book of the Council, with no other alteration than a slight change in the form; but, instead of retaining the names of the members as *signatures*, each entry, after the accession of Henry VI., states what numbers were present on the occasion. No other attention to chronological order was observed in entering the acts of the Council than by placing them under the year of the king's reign in which they occurred; and it is not unusual to find a proceeding which took place in May preceded by one in June, and followed by another in February or March, in the same year. In this work, however, they are inserted in strict chronological order; and any such other proceedings of the Council as have been discovered are introduced into their proper places.' (Vol. ii. p. xxvi.)

And again—

'The Register, or "Book of the Council," which has been printed

in this work, now forms two folio volumes of the Cottonian Library, but it originally consisted of several rolls of parchment, which, for convenience of reference, were cut into pages and bound up into books soon after they fell into the hands of Sir Robert Cotton. . . .

‘At what time those MSS. were obtained from the Treasury of the Exchequer, or in what manner they became the property of Sir Robert Cotton, it would be vain to inquire. It is certain that much of his invaluable collection once formed part of the public archives; and as that fact can be established by strong, if not conclusive, proof, it is much to be lamented that their value, as *legal evidence*, should be impaired by their not being now in the proper custody.’ (Vol. v. pp. iii, iv.)

These two extracts sufficiently describe both the sources from which Sir Harris Nicolas drew his materials, and the method which he adopted for building up a consecutive and complete historical narrative, with the help of the transcripts of Rymer and others now preserved in the British Museum which are supplementary to the original documents in the Cottonian collection; but a passage in the preface to vol. i. makes reference to the difficulties which must beset an editor who is to a great extent dependent upon the labours of inaccurate or imperfectly educated transcribers. Each of Sir Harris Nicolas’s first six volumes contains a chronological catalogue of the articles included therein, which is of great use in showing the historical sequence of the documents, though in many instances the dates given are only conjectural; and each also of his volumes contains an elaborate preface, which not only gives in the form of a narrative an exhaustive *précis* of the text and an account of the documents printed, as in the case of the ‘Book of the Council,’ but in the case of vol. vi. contains in addition a long historical account of the functions and privileges of various high officers, such as the King’s Secretary, the custodians of the Great and Privy Seals, and the King’s Chamberlain, whose duties are elaborately described and traced from the earliest point even in some cases down to the present century. In fact, were it not somewhat invidious to show the least disposition to find fault with the results of the patient industry of Sir Harris Nicolas, to which we are indebted for the collection and publication of so much matter of the greatest historical interest, it must be confessed that these seven volumes are somewhat unduly spun out, and that the temptation to make the most of his materials has led the editor to distend his text with such lengthy disquisitions of his own as may deter the ordinary reader from approaching a subject which requires to be treated so voluminously.

It will be noticed that none of the documents printed in the first six volumes of Sir Harris's work, not even the so-called 'Book of the Council,' which runs for fourteen years only, ending in 1435, have any pretension to be regarded as a continuous register from day to day of the proceedings of the Privy Council, but in his seventh volume Sir Harris at last reaches surer ground, and in his preface to that volume seems to rejoice that now a more authentic source of information is at his disposal. Let him describe the change in his own words :—

'It is observed in the preface to the sixth volume of the "Proceedings of the Privy Council" that the Register, or "Book of the Council," does not appear to have been continued after the 13th year of King Henry VI., 1435; and that, with the exception of some original minutes, ordinances, and letters, nothing is known of the proceedings of the Privy Council until the latter part of the reign of King Henry VIII. On August 10, in the thirty-second year of that monarch, 1540, a Register of its Acts was, however, again begun; and it may be inferred from the statement in the first page that its Proceedings had not been regularly recorded in any part of that century, or, at all events, not for very many years.

'It is there said that on that day an Order was taken and determined by his Majesty, with the advice of his Highness's Privy Council, whose names are mentioned, "that there should be a Clerk attendant upon the said Council to write, enter, and register all such decrees, determinations, letters, and other such things as he should be appointed to enter in a Book, to remain always as a ledger, as well for the discharge of the said Counsellors touching such things as they should pass from time to time, as also for a memorial unto them of their own proceedings; unto the which office William Paget, late the Queen's Secretary, was appointed by the king's highness, and sworn in the presence of the said Council."

'This memorandum affords, however, nearly as strong a presumption that a Clerk of the Council was then appointed for the first time as that the Proceedings of the Council had not before been recorded; whereas it is certain that precisely the same duties were performed by the Clerks of the Council in the reigns of Henry IV., V., and VI., and that the office existed in the time of Edward IV. and Henry VII., if not those also immediately before this ordinance was made.

'Very few of the acts of Henry VIII.'s Privy Council before the year 1540, when the Register commences, are now extant, and all which are known are those of the 12th, 24th, and 25th Hen. VIII., printed in the appendix to this volume, and those of the 24th, 25th, and 28th Henry VIII. in the collection of State Papers recently published by his Majesty's command. Thus for nearly an entire century there is no Register whatever preserved, even if one was ever made, of the Proceedings of the Privy Council; and when the important events in the reigns of King Edward IV., Edward V., Richard III., and Henry VII.

are remembered, the loss of the Council records cannot be too much regretted.' (Vol. vii. p. i.)

After the elaborate mosaic structure put together by Sir Harris in his first six volumes, it is a relief to reach at last the more solid foundation for historical research provided by an authentic series of original documents, and in this connexion we are introduced also to the three volumes named in the heading to this article, which are the direct successors, though after an interval of more than fifty years, of Sir Harris Nicolas's seventh volume, and so far as their contents are concerned may be considered as forming part of the same publication.

Soon after the present Government came into office, the attention of the Lord President of the Council was called to the invaluable series of manuscript registers of the Privy Council which were preserved in his office, and daily used for reference by the officers of the Privy Council proper and of the Judicial Committee, and to the danger of losing this unique collection of records and precedents by the mischance of fire or other accident. It was proposed, therefore, to recommence the publication of these records from the point at which Sir Harris had somewhat unaccountably laid down his work before he had printed two years of the actual register. After various official delays, the work was entrusted by Lord Cranbrook to Mr. Dasent, an officer in one of the branches of the Council Office, and in 1890 the first volume of the new series appeared, to be shortly followed by its two successors, just fifty-three years after the publication of vol. vii. of the first series. Very different are the conditions under which the two issues have been made; economy appears to have been no object fifty or sixty years ago with the Record Commissioners, who enjoyed the luxury of a special fount of type which has probably long ago been melted down, and the appearance of the work generally strongly contrasts with the hideous volumes now offered to the public by the parsimony of Her Majesty's Treasury and Stationery Office. Not less marked, however, is the contrast which we find when we come to compare the contents of the two issues. In place of the long prefaces and chronological rearrangements of Sir Harris, Mr. Dasent contents himself with a short preface and a copious index to each volume, leaving the text to speak for itself; in fact, except for a brief description of the different manuscripts and of the more interesting entries and allusions in the Register, the editor's chief care has evidently been to keep himself out of sight, and to leave the historical student

free to draw his own deductions from the records now made accessible to him.

We extract, however, from the preface to vol. i. of the new series an account of the collection of manuscripts now in the custody of the Privy Council Office, which may, perhaps, come as a surprise even to many otherwise well-informed persons to whom the existence of these volumes has before been unknown.

‘As has already been mentioned, the first entry of the existing Register was made on August 10, 1510, in the thirty-second year of the reign of King Henry VIII., and from that date until the present time the continuity of the record is almost unbroken, and, though the character of the registration is not uniform throughout, time and carelessness have not in a great degree impaired the value of the interesting series of volumes preserved in the Privy Council Office. There are, nevertheless, some blanks; the register from July 22, 1543, to May 10, 1545, has disappeared, but the succeeding volume has found its way to the British Museum, and still remains there, together with an exceedingly inaccurate transcript of a portion of it comprised in the Harleian collection. The Register of the reign of Edward VI. in the Council Office series appears to be complete, but that of his sister, Queen Mary, is defective, inasmuch as there are but scanty records of the first six weeks of her reign. Fortunately, however, the Hatfield collection of manuscripts contains a volume in which is bound up a document which is evidently the rough draft of the Register of that period, of which, by the kind permission of Lord Salisbury, a copy has recently been made in order to supply the blank in the Council Office series. At later dates other *lacunae* appear, amounting at the most to twenty-two years, some of which are in Elizabeth’s reign and some in that of Charles I. This latter blank, however, is no cause for wonder, if we remember that when the king left Oxford for the North all his papers were purposely burned in order that they might not fall into the hands of the Parliament. The fire at Whitehall in 1618 may not improbably have been the cause of the loss of other missing volumes. Diligent inquiry, both public and private, has at various times been made, not always without success, in the hope that unofficial collections might contain what was wanting to complete the series, but it is feared that nothing more may now be expected from these sources, and that we must be content with the record as it now stands—a wonderfully perfect record, if we consider all the risks which it has undergone.’ (Vol. i. p. viii.)

It is not always possible to identify the officers to whom the actual authorship of this series of MSS. must be attributed. Undoubtedly Paget, whose appointment as Clerk of the Council under the new régime is recorded on the first page of the register, is responsible for the record until the end of September 1541, when John Mason is appointed to

succeed him in this office, and from that date until the close of the reign of Henry VIII. a great portion of the MS. is in Mason's handwriting, which, like that of his predecessor Paget, can be identified by comparison with many documents preserved in the Record Office.

Though we are, however, nowhere told that Paget had a colleague to share his duties other than the ordinary clerical assistants who appear to have been generally called in whenever an entry of unusual length or formality had to be made, it is quite clear that soon after Mason's appointment a second Clerk of the Council, William Honnings, was sworn in, and at a later date even a third Clerk, Thomas Chaloner, is mentioned, though it is not equally evident that all these three were holding office at the same time; but on April 17, 1548, it is distinctly stated that there were three Clerks of the Council, William Honnings, Sir Thomas Chaloner, and Armigill Wade, the last having received no salary since his appointment in the previous summer, and provision is made for their payment on a graduated scale in accordance with their seniority. William Honnings, however, appears to have been involved in the disgrace of the Protector, as we shortly afterwards find that the first place amongst the Clerks is taken by William Thomas, the king's political Mentor, who was to pay dearly for his proclivities in the next reign. These officers appear each to have taken but a short turn of duty, and the handwriting of the MS. is consequently constantly changed; but on September 24, 1551, we note the appointment of Barnard Hampton as Clerk of the Council, and, as Mr. Dacent says—

'We may perhaps be permitted to infer that from this point until the end of the volume the MS., which is now most distinctly and even delicately written, is, with the exception of a few pages, . . . by his hand.' (Vol. iii. p. vi.)

We cannot but observe that then, as now, the office of Clerk of the Council was one which required very high qualifications in its holders, who in their daily association with the Executive Government enjoyed opportunities of bringing their talents under the notice of those in power. Both Sir William Paget and Sir John Mason became in due course members of that body whose proceedings it had before been their duty to record, the former also becoming a principal secretary. Honnings' chances of preferment seem to have vanished with the fall of Somerset, but the intimate relations of William Thomas with the young King Edward VI., are well known, and both Sir Thomas Chaloner and Armigill

Wade were frequently employed to conduct such delicate transactions, both at home and abroad, as required the employment of verbal instructions on the part of the Government, thus foreshadowing the duties often entrusted to the Clerks of the Council in more modern times. Amidst the universal corruption of the age it is satisfactory to observe that, so far as the evidence afforded by the registers enables us to judge, these officers seem in the main to have had clean hands. Paget, no doubt, though perhaps not when he acted as Clerk, had amassed a great fortune and a great estate, and Sir John Mason had succeeded to a lucrative place—that of Master of the Posts—but amongst the daily records of grants of lands on easy terms and profitable preferments to Court favourites, we find none relating to the Clerks of the Council, with the exception of William Thomas, who was evidently not above taking advantage of his position to put forward his claims to reward, although he did not always succeed in securing what he desired. This is the more remarkable, as the salary attached to the office appears not to have exceeded 50*l.* per annum in the case of the principal Clerk, and to have been as low as fifty marks in the case of the junior, whilst the solitary perquisite—that of supplying the stationery required at the Council table—did not amount to more than 1*l.* per annum.*

On examining the subject matter contained in the entries which record the business transacted by the Council, two points are most prominently brought under our notice, the first being the absolute silence of the Register as to certain events of the utmost interest. On this head we may remark the wording of the entry recording the appointment of Paget, in which it is stated that the Clerk should register all such things ‘as he shuld be appoynted to entre in ‘a booke,’ and on this point the present editor remarks that—

‘It does not appear that the Clerk was necessarily present at each meeting of the Council, and the minutes must, therefore, sometimes have been dictated to him, probably by one of the King’s Principal Secretaries, which may probably account for the infinite variety in the spelling of many of the proper names. It is obvious that a record made under such limitations must naturally observe a most disappointing silence as to many topics of absorbing interest which could not safely be set forth in a formal Register intended to be handed down to posterity through a succession of officials, and that the deliberations of a body which was practically the predecessor of the modern Cabinet of

Ministers, must often have been of too confidential a nature to be entrusted even to the sworn officer of the Council. This may account for some of the many occasions on which there is no record of what passed at the meeting of the Council. Thus we may search the Register in vain for any record of the proceedings in connexion with the disgrace and execution of Catherine Howard. . . . ' (Vol. i. p. viii.)

Again the same provoking silence is observed with regard to the final trial and execution of the Protector Somerset, when, as Mr. Dasent says in his preface to vol. iii., it is not until 'we find an entry referring to "the late Duke of "Somerset," that we learn how complete was Northumberland's triumph,' as no mention is made in the Register of the trial and execution of his once all-powerful rival.

The explanation, no doubt, is that, as is said to be the case with the Cabinet of modern times, there was generally an inner circle, a Cabinet within a Cabinet, by which the more important issues were decided before being laid before the Council, which in the periods of the ascendancy of men like Somerset and Northumberland was reduced to the necessity of accepting the measures laid before it by the dominant faction, and of providing the means for their execution.

This brings us to the second point to which our attention is called by an examination of the contents of these volumes—viz. the wide range of the subjects which were daily submitted for the consideration of the Council, whether at its meetings in London or attending on the Sovereign during his progress and his stay at Greenwich, Hampton Court or Windsor, for, at whatever place the King might be, there the King's Privy Council was in attendance upon him. In his preface to his seventh volume Sir Harris Nicolas says:—

'The greater part of the members of the Privy Council were in constant attendance upon the King. They resided in the Court, and accompanied him wherever he went; and usually consisted of the Great Officers of the Household, a Bishop, and one of the Principal Secretaries; whilst the Lord Chancellor, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the other Principal Secretary, and a few official personages remained in London to direct such public business as was necessarily transacted in the metropolis. A constant correspondence was maintained between the two boards; but the Register was always confined to the proceedings of the Council with the King, except in November and December 1540, when a large majority of the members were sitting daily at Westminster to investigate the charges brought against Queen Katherine Howard.' (Vol. vii. p. ix.)

And again—

‘To specify the subjects which occupied the attention of the Privy Council from 1540 to 1542 would be to mention nearly everything connected with the conduct of individuals towards each other and in relation to the Government.’ (Vol. vii. p. xxv.)

There is little to add to these statements except to point out that the investigations as to the Queen’s conduct are not set forth in the Register, and that at the close of the reign of Henry VIII. his successor’s Council in daily attendance comprised many members who had no official position in the Household, and that, as Mr. Dasent observes, ‘there seems ‘to have been no point of domestic or public life in England ‘which was not subject to the interference of the Council,’ whilst the army of retainers who accompanied the councillors in their attendance on the King in his progresses throughout the country must soon, in those days of imperfect communication, have exhausted the resources of each locality, and no doubt gave ground for well-founded complaints against the royal purveyors.

So numerous, however, are the different subjects comprised in the entries in the Register, that it is almost impossible to reduce them all to separate categories; but religion, trade, foreign relations, fiscal measures, the army and navy, Scotland and Ireland, give rise to a great proportion of the business, whilst the profligate dispersal of the newly acquired property of the Crown, the Church and Chantry lands, occasions almost daily entries in the Register. The references to Parliament are provokingly few, but several entries refer to the nomination of candidates by the Council, and instructions to the returning officers to see that the candidates agreeable to the Government were duly elected. Mr. Dasent, however, draws our attention particularly to an entry on May 6, 1548, in which it is recorded that the members for Coventry and Lynn so stoutly opposed the passage through Parliament of the Bill for granting to the King the Chantry, Guild, and College lands throughout England, that it was thought necessary to make a private bargain on the part of the Crown with the members for those towns whereby, in consideration of their withdrawing their opposition to the Bill, enjoyment of their lands should be secured to them notwithstanding its provisions—an early instance of parliamentary obstruction and the devices necessary to defeat it. Numerous as were the Bills of Attainder introduced into Parliament at this period, there is

only one instance recorded in the Register in which we are supplied with the accusations brought against the culprit, the list of the thirty-three charges made against Lord Seymour, of Sudley, Lord High Admiral of England and brother of the Protector, being entered in the Register at full length, although the evidence on which these numerous charges were made is not recorded. It is, however, sufficiently clear that, whatever may have been his other faults, Lord Seymour had abused his position of Lord Admiral by affording protection to pirates, even if he did not, as was suspected, participate in their gains. His condemnation and execution, the details of which are graphically recorded in the Register, were, no doubt, justified by the political necessities of the time, but it is impossible not to recognise that Lord Seymour's projects must to some extent have been encouraged by the powerful party who were beginning to be dissatisfied with the virtual autocracy of the Protector, although his secret supporters were unable to save him from the penalty which so swiftly followed his trial. Before the close of the year, however, this dissatisfaction had reached such a pitch that the party opposed to Somerset, which included nearly the whole of the Council, led by Lord Warwick, afterwards Duke of Northumberland, took measures resulting in the deposition of the Protector, of which a most interesting recital is given at length in the Register. On this occasion his enemies did not exact the supreme penalty, as in the case of his brother, but the *précis* of the succeeding events recorded in the Register, as given by the editor in the preface to vol. iii., shows how the late Protector was, after a time, allowed to resume his place at the Council Board, and even to take an important part in the regulation of ecclesiastical questions. This somewhat contemptuous toleration, however, was coincident with the steady growth of the power and aggrandisement of the Dudleys, and Lord Warwick's assumption of the title of Duke of Northumberland, with the corresponding elevation of his principal supporters, was the prelude to the last act of the long-drawn tragedy. This was on October 4, 1551, and on October 17 an entry in the Register shows that the late Protector was a prisoner in the Tower, where he remained until his execution at the end of the following January. No details are given as to the charges brought against him, and it is only incidentally that we find entries subsequently relating to the 'conspiracy' in which he, with many of his friends who also suffered death, was engaged.

The unsettled state of religious opinion is shown by various entries relating to the destruction of images in churches and eating meat in Lent, and the obstinacy of Hooper on such a small point as the vestments to be worn at his consecration contrasts strongly with the graver questions which led to the deprivation of the Bishops of Winchester and Chichester, whilst scandal was not silent as to the matrimonial relations of some of the ecclesiastics in high positions who had accepted the new order of things. The allusions to Anne Ascue and Joan Bocher remind us that the fire of religious persecution, so soon to break out afresh in its full fury under Mary, was not entirely extinguished during the period embraced by these volumes. Most of the entries concerning the Church are, however, of one, and that a very painful character, as they relate to the seizure of Church plate and the dispersal of the lands which had hitherto been devoted to religious purposes. This process of spoliation went on continuously, no matter who might be in power, and an entry on September 24, 1550, gives an account of the total amount of plate melted down in the Tower alone which is formidable in its total, whilst allusions to the King's bell-metal and the ominous activity in the lead trade show how rapid was the destruction of religious edifices.

Meanwhile, many as were the well-paid sinecures enjoyed by Court favourites, one office cannot be described in those terms. The Chancellor of the Court of the Augmentation of the Revenues of the Crown, who had the care of all the lands diverted from religious and charitable uses, was in constant employment. Nearly every day entries appear in the Register according grants of land in fee simple or on lease on favourable terms to those about the Court. The names of the greater personages, with the exception of the Duke of Northumberland, do not, it is true, appear often as profiting by these grants, gorged as they must have been by the plunder secured at earlier opportunities, but the smaller fry now clamour for their share of the spoils of the Church, and serjeants of the ewry, grooms of the pantry, yeomen of the cellar, footmen—and, in short, every petty official of the Court—appear as receiving grants from the Augmentation Office at nominal rents, and the number of entries of this nature contrasts very unfavourably with the scanty mention of that provision for education with which this reign is generally credited.

How the Council dealt with the Princess Mary has been

told by Mr. Froude and other historians, but the struggle is so graphically described in the Register that no excuse is needed for quoting the brief *précis* of the proceedings given by the present editor in the preface to his third volume :—

‘The doctrinal points at issue and the question as to the disposition of the Church lands were no doubt at the time of burning importance to the country at large, but for us the greatest interest is centred round the dramatic story, as told in the Register, of the struggle not unsuccessfully made by the Princess Mary to preserve her freedom of action in her own house with respect to the proscribed service of the Mass, in spite of all the efforts of the Council to restrain her. Previous attempts to control her by putting pressure upon her chaplains having failed, the Council sent for the principal officers of her household and instructed them to inform her that she could no longer be permitted to use the Mass, and to forbid her chaplains to officiate and her household to attend. As was to be expected, these officers discharged their commission in but a half-hearted way, and on reporting their failure to the Council were at once committed to prison, though subsequently released on the plea of ill-health. Under these circumstances, the Lord Chancellor, Sir A. Wingfield and Sir W. Petre were sent by their colleagues to insist upon Mary’s compliance with the decision of the Council, and to persuade her to give up the Mass and to adopt the new Order of Divine Service in her house.

‘The result was that the deputation retired after a most satisfactory interview with the Princess, who, with her father’s spirit, refused to submit to dictation, appealed to the promise made, as she alleged, to the emperor that she should not be required to make any such change, protested her loyalty to her brother, and finally retired to her chamber with the honours of war, dismissing the envoys with certain sarcastic remarks as to their physical condition and their conveniently short memories.’ (Vol. iii. p. xxiv.)

All our sympathies are with the Princess, as indeed must have been those of two at least of the envoys themselves, as soon after Mary’s accession to the throne we find Lord Riche and Sir W. Petre in their places at the Council table, Sir A. Wingfield having died in the interval.

Nothing is more remarkable, according to modern ideas, than the constant interference of the Council with the ordinary course of trade. It is not only that the Crown itself appears as a dealer in foreign markets, the sale of the King’s alum and fustians being regulated by the Council, but that for every branch of foreign trade licences had to be procured, not, we may be sure, without payment, in order to export such things as cloth, coal, corn, and leather, whilst the Council vainly attempted under heavy penalties to fix the price of all commodities of general consumption within the kingdom, such as bread, meat, and beer. These restrictions,

as usual, were very generally evaded, but the penalties were unsparingly enforced in all cases brought to the Council's notice. The great trading corporations, such as the Merchant Adventurers and the Merchants of the Staple, were, no doubt, able to secure, for a consideration, favourable treatment, but the difficulties of smaller commercial men must have been very great. Nevertheless, besides the representatives of the Hanseatic merchants constantly referred to under the generic name of the Steelyard, many foreign traders seem to have permanently taken up their abode in this country, and often to have been of considerable service to the Government both at home and abroad. Vol. iii. records that a formal treaty of commerce was concluded with the King of Sweden to secure the freedom of intercourse between his country and England, and the exchange of his silver, lead, iron, and copper for the cloth manufactured on our looms; but the same volume also records the forfeiture of the privileges of the Steelyard on what appear to be most insufficient and even iniquitous pretences. Trade, however, notwithstanding all restrictions imposed by the law, was, no doubt, profitable, and would have been still more profitable had it not been for the prevalence of piracy, mention of which is constantly made throughout the Register. As a matter of fact, nearly every merchantman was a pirate when an opportunity occurred of overpowering a weaker ship of any nationality, but there were, besides, regular pirates who haunted the Narrow Seas, who made no pretence of commerce and at one period secured for themselves strongholds and places of refuge in Scilly and elsewhere, partly in consequence of the connivance of the Lord Admiral. Numerous questions as to piracy or lawful prize, both in time of peace and war, which should have been referred to the Admiralty Court, were submitted to the decision of the Council itself, as the delays in that Court were a public scandal, many years often elapsing before decision was given. Many entries in the Register relate to the condition of the coinage. The necessities of the Government induced Henry VIII. to sanction a debased issue, and this evil practice was continued under his successor to such an extent that prices of the ordinary necessities of life rose to a prohibitive point, and the Council vainly endeavoured to mitigate this evil by fixing the price of the principal articles of food, calling upon the Lord Mayor and other authorities of the City to induce the merchants to sell their goods more cheaply. It is needless to say that these measures failed, and that sooner or later the debased

currency had to be 'called down' to its true value, whilst the difference in the standard made it worth while to export English money to Ireland, of which advantage was at once taken. It was in this connexion that the Council, finding that the Bordeaux trade was coming to a standstill because our merchants were forbidden to offer English money to the French traders in payment for their wine, adopted the strange course of addressing a memorial to the French ambassador suggesting that, in order to preserve the trade, recourse should be had to the primitive commercial transaction of barter, and that the French regulations which insisted upon ready money should be overruled.

Throughout the Register it is evident that the Government was constantly in the greatest straits for money. Somerset's extravagant system of administration in particular exhausted the exchequer, and continual applications had to be made to the Flemish capitalists, the Fuggers or Folkers and the Schetz, either for fresh loans or for extension of time for payment of old loans. Meanwhile the garrisons in France and Scotland were often unpaid and unfed. Warrants to one or other of the numerous treasurers of the Augmentation Court, the Court of Wards, the Exchequer, &c. were, according to the Register, constantly issued, it is true: but a warrant on an empty treasure chest is of little avail, and payment was therefore often unavoidably deferred. The result was that the victualling officers at Calais, Portsmouth or Berwick had often to make bricks without straw, and that when their patience or their credit was exhausted the unhappy garrisons or crews perished of starvation and disease. The natural consequence of this vicious system was that the victuallers took good care that, whatever happened, the Crown should not be charged too little when the stores which they provided came at last to be paid for, fraudulent accounts and peculation were the general rule, and a swarm of auditors were required to examine and pass all accounts, some of whom, in their turn, found it possible to amass large fortunes in the exercise of their duties. It is noticeable, however, that money was always available for extravagant presents of plate to foreign envoys and ambassadors, and that the several members of the ruling faction, who were required to furnish between them a considerable standing army, received their payments with remarkable regularity, though humbler claimants had to remain unpaid.

Whilst all these points are clearly set down in the entries in the Register, it is also possible to learn from them some-

thing of the general condition of the population of the country. The creation of large estates by the transfer of the bulk of the Church lands to the courtiers resulted in a great change in the conditions of rural life in England. Large grazing farms replaced the more modest arable holdings, and the dispossessed tenants, like their former landlords, the monks, lost their means of livelihood. Small towns like Godmanchester began to decay, and the Register contains frequent entries relating to distress and famine in many parts of England, which compelled the Council to modify in many cases the restrictions usually laid upon the transport of grain. Many of the large estates were increased by illegal or, at the best, by unusual inclosures, and questions as to the rights of commoners were constantly submitted to the Council. The justices were commanded to enforce the Vagabond Acts, minor disturbances and tumults were repressed most vigorously, the pillory being in constant use, and the number of men in England who had suffered the loss of one or both ears must have been very considerable. Curiously enough, little is said in the Register as to the serious rising in the West, which was so sternly put down by Lord Russell, the Lieutenant of the West Parts, and Lord Grey de Wilton, and but for occasional allusions to 'the Western rebels' there is little indication of the danger which so nearly affected the Government. 'Lewd words' or 'seditious prophecies' were a constant cause of committal to the Tower, which with the many other prisons was always full to overflowing, and in several instances we find that the Lieutenant of the Tower was empowered to make use of torture in order to extract confessions from his prisoners.

The foreign relations of England during the period covered by that portion of the Privy Council Register which is now published, may briefly be summed up in the one word 'Calais.' The preservation of this town and its neighbouring 'Marches' entailed upon this country a continual drain of men and money; and it is not until we read the innumerable warrants granted by the Council to defray the charges which had to be met on the other side of the Channel that we appreciate how great must have been the strain upon our resources. In addition to Calais, Henry had seized Boulogne, and to the cost of the garrisons was added that of a numerous field army, both in his time and in that of his successor. The constant state of warfare around Calais and on the Scottish borders attracted to our service many foreign mercenaries, and Spaniards, Germans, Italians, and even

Albanians, crowded the northern wardenries and were employed to put down the western rebels. Such mercenaries, however, required regular payments, and instructions are therefore given by the Council to the commanders in France and on the Borders to pay the foreigners their wages even when the English soldiers had to be put off with promises. Some of the mercenary captains appear to have served the English Crown for many years, as their names occur constantly in the Register; and one of them, Julian Romero, who appears to have been an especial favourite, rose to considerable distinction or notoriety in the later troubled times in the Low Countries.

The loss, however, of England's Continental possessions was approaching. Even in Henry's days Boulogne was only held with great difficulty, and at one time a formidable diversion was attempted by the French, whose fleet was practically for some days master of the Isle of Wight and of the Solent, where the foundering of the 'Mary Rose' with her captain, Sir George Carew, foreshadowed the fate of Kempenfeldt and the 'Royal George'; and by the date of the first fall of the Protector, Calais and its dependency Guisnes were all that were left of the Plantagenet conquests. The connection of France with Scotland was a fertile source of anxiety to our statesmen, 'Scotlande being now made 'Frenche,' and every opportunity was taken by the French to embroil us with our northern neighbours and to keep open sores which, in spite of the Protector's foolish and cruel invasions, might otherwise have been healed, so small a matter as the partition of the Debatable Ground being made an occasion for French interference, whilst French influence was industriously used to counteract the weight of the so-called English party in Scotland, which was only kept alive by repeated subsidies from the Council.

Numerous entries relate to the navy and to the provision of victuals for the crews. The north of Europe and the Baltic provided us with the pitch and hemp required in the dockyards, and also with gunpowder; but considerable efforts were made to foster the manufacture of sailcloth at home, Bretons being imported to teach us to make 'polldavies' and 'olorons.' The debts of the Admiralty, however, became at one time so pressing that many ships were paid off and laid up in the Medway or sold out of the service, and this opportunity seems to have been taken to get rid of the galleys, which must always have been unsuited to our stormy seas. It is noticeable that the crews of these vessels, though

described as 'forsares,' seem not to have been regular galley slaves, as money is sent down for distribution amongst them when the crews were broken up; but there is at least one mention of a culprit being sent to serve in a galley as a punishment. This reduction in the effective fleet was not without its material compensation to the Lord Admiral, as we read that the King gave to Lord Clinton 'the covering 'of clothe of golde belonging to the captaine's cabane or 'poupe of the gallic.'

During the twelve years covered by these volumes there were many changes in the government of Ireland. At first we find Sir A. St. Leger in power at Dublin Castle, and on his recall Sir Edward Bellingham was sent over with instructions to use the utmost severity in repressing the insurrection then raging in Leinster. Bellingham's short but successful rule was terminated by his illness and untimely death, and the Council again had recourse to the services of St. Leger. A little later, however, the designs of France became so threatening that it was evident that a stronger hand was required at the helm, and it was, therefore, decided that some one of what would now be called Cabinet rank, some prominent member of the Council, should be sent over in the emergency. The choice fell upon Lord Cobham, an experienced soldier, who at once sent over Sir James Croftes to take the preliminary steps in organisation and to fortify Cork and Kinsale against the expected descent of the French. This alarm, however, speedily passed away, and as a matter of fact Lord Cobham never went to Dublin, the result being that Sir James Croftes himself became Lord Depnty, and remained in office throughout the remainder of the period covered by these volumes.

As is not unnatural, the entries in the Register relating to Ireland are numerous, and we learn from them that grave irregularities existed in the administration whoever might be in command, and that the English garrison, paid for by the Crown as soldiers, seem to have been expected to furnish the members of the Irish Government with household servants. The plantation system is already in operation, and we see from entries relating to the dispersal of Church property in Ireland that an official survey of a great part of the kingdom was already in existence, whilst the present annual migration of harvesters across the Irish Channel was then to some extent foreshadowed by the constant employment of Irish kerne in our Border warfare. The plan of subsidising and ennobling the Irish chieftains begun by Henry VIII.

was continued under his successor, whilst in the vain hope of extracting a revenue from Ireland the Irish Mint was let out to farm to undertakers. This arrangement no doubt was exceedingly profitable to those who thereby secured the lucrative privilege of still further debasing the coinage of Ireland, already, as we have seen, at even a lower level than that of England, but can scarcely have improved the condition of the people, nor permanently added to the King's revenue.

Much money, too, was spent in a pursuit which, like an *ignis fatuus*, has often since deluded the credulous. Both Henry and his son were persuaded that if the mines in Ireland were properly worked a great profit would accrue to the Crown by the discovery of the precious metals. Commissions were, therefore, sent over to prospect, and finally, under Edward VI., a separate department for exploiting the Irish mines seems to have been established with a German expert at its head, and a staff of German miners under him. No sooner, however, had the matter reached this practical stage than it became apparent that German experts were not likely to be more successful than their English or Irish predecessors, and the Council gladly abandoned the costly experiment.

It must not be supposed that the brief recapitulation given in the preceding pages has exhausted the subjects of interest contained in the entries in the Privy Council Register, as such a catalogue, if it were complete, would far exceed the space available on such an occasion as the present. Mention, however, must be made of the method employed by the Council in most important cases, and even when it was using its powers to interfere with the ordinary details of domestic life in England, such as the settlement of disputes between comparatively insignificant country gentlemen. The Council, in the first instance, sends a summons or 'letter of appearance,' either directly or through the sheriff, and only occasionally was it found necessary to secure obedience by sending down one of the guard or a serjeant-at-arms to conduct the summoned parties to the Court. On their arrival the Council seems, as a rule, to have appointed a small committee of its members to decide as to the gravity of the offence or the settlement of the dispute, as the case might be. The report of this committee was quickly followed by fine, imprisonment and the pillory in the more serious cases, and by binding over the parties, with sureties, under recognisances to obey the decision of the Council, and to be

of 'good abearing' for the future in cases which did not amount to actual crime. It is amusing to notice that when nothing could be proved against an accused person he was generally dismissed 'with a good lesson,' implying that he might consider himself very fortunate to have escaped.

The number of these recognisances set out at full length in the Register shows to what an extent the practice of demanding securities for good behaviour was carried by those responsible for the executive government of England in Tudor times, and gives rise to reflection as to the sad fate of those who could find no one to become bail for them. They, no doubt, were committed to one of the Counters or to the Marshalsea, where, from the moment of their committal, the cost of their maintenance had to be defrayed by their friends, and many entries show that the Knight Marshal and the other gaolers, following the example of the Lieutenant of the Tower, expected to be paid in full for all charges incurred by them in respect of such prisoners before their release, and that death, perhaps from gaol fever, though it might often set free the unhappy prisoner, did not discharge his friends from the necessity of satisfying these claims.

Much that is contained in these volumes is necessarily somewhat obscure in consequence of the brevity of most of the entries; but in many cases the desired clue can be obtained by reference to the corresponding dates in some of the admirable works which we owe to the public spirit of the Camden Society, and especially to the 'Diary of Henry Machyn,' edited by the late Mr. Nichols, and published by the Society in 1848, in which that observant undertaker, amongst his professional descriptions of funeral pageants, makes many interesting allusions to the political and religious vicissitudes of the time.

Some of the more dramatic episodes have not escaped the notice of later historians, and Mr. Froude has reproduced, embodied in his volumes, the incident of Princess Mary's triumph over the envoys of the Council already mentioned, and also the very circumstantial narrative, as recorded in the Register, of the disappearance of the document which was supposed to contain the intentions of the dead King Henry VIII., and of the expedient by which the convenient memory of Paget was allowed to supply the place of the missing paper in order to justify his colleagues in their assumption of higher titles and corresponding estates; but much important matter has now been for the first time made available to the ordinary student by the laudable

enterprise of the present heads of the Privy Council Office, by whom was entertained the project of continuing the work begun so long ago by Sir Harris Nicolas. In order to start the publication again the co-operation of the Master of the Rolls was secured; but in accordance, we believe, with a new doctrine that each Government department should in future be responsible for the publication of its own archives, the cost of this issue seems to have been transferred to the Council Office estimates, as is shown by a slight modification in the title page to vol. iii., and we may therefore hope that more rapid progress may be made with the issue of these interesting documents than might have been the case had they been left to compete for publication with the crowd of other interesting manuscripts which claim to appear on the estimates of the Record Office.

ART. VII.—1. *English Men of Action: Rodney.* By DAVID HANNAY. London: 1891.

2. *The Sea Service.* By Commander C. N. ROBINSON, R.N. Illustrated by W. H. OVEREND. London: 1891.

3. *The Official Catalogue of the Royal Naval Exhibition.* 1891.

THE Naval Exhibition of last summer and the interest which it excited naturally led to the publication of a great number of books and booklets on naval subjects. Most of these were of course ephemeral; and having served their purpose, will not be heard of again. Others may have a longer life; and some have a value far beyond what was to be looked for in works almost avowedly written to catch the market. Among these we may especially commend the little book by Captain Robinson, which we have named above. It is a sketch of the internal history of our navy, containing in a few pages much that cannot easily be found elsewhere; daintily illustrated notices of dress, of etiquette, of manners and customs now dead or dying, and some of the old superstitions of the sea, half naval and wholly pagan, which are now almost extinct among British seamen.

That Mr. Hannay's *Life of Rodney* should appear in the same season is mainly a coincidence, for it has long been announced as a volume of the *Men of Action Series*; though it is quite possible that the fashion of the day has had something to do with the date of its issue. We are,

indeed, led to suppose that it has ; for many marks of haste disfigure an otherwise clever and lively sketch, written with an extensive though inaccurate knowledge of the history of our navy. The rule not to quote authorities, which is common to all the series now so much in vogue, may be convenient to a hurried or a slipshod writer ; but it assuredly permits, if it does not encourage, a carelessness and want of exactness, which deprive many very able works of much of their value. This is more to be lamented in the present instance, as there was, and is, plenty of room for a good *Life of Rodney*. That by General Mundy, published more than sixty years ago, and long since out of print, has some of the advantages and many of the faults inherent in a memoir written by a near relation without either literary ability or professional knowledge. It is a book which few care to read ; and thus in the lapse of years the fame of Rodney has been to some extent clouded over, and his glory forgotten. It was a curious commentary on this to notice that not a single ‘relic,’ not a single memento of Rodney was to be found in the Exhibition at Chelsea. There was, indeed, a fine portrait by Reynolds, lent by the Queen, from St. James’s Palace ; there were engravings after Gainsborough and others ; paintings of the battle of Dominica and one of the fight off Cape St. Vincent ; but nothing personal : no snuff-box, no star, no sword, not even the celebrated casket of gold in which he received the freedom of the City of London. Other admirals, indeed, of merit equal or even superior to his were in the same category of neglect or oblivion ; but a later date and the very critical circumstances of his great victory seemed to point out Rodney as one likely to have still some share in the popular favour.

Unfortunately Mr. Hannay has done little more than rewrite General Mundy’s book in better style. He knows, indeed, more of the history of our navy than the general did ; but then the general did not pretend to know anything. Mr. Hannay, on the other hand, does know a good deal, though not so much as he thinks he does ; and his disquisitions on the state of the navy in the last century are marked by an extreme inaccuracy. Many of the details are absolutely wrong ; scarcely one is entirely correct. It is, for instance, absolutely wrong to say that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ‘it was wholly the theory and very much the practice that when a ship was paid off, all who ‘had been on board her, except her captain and lieutenants, ‘ceased to be officially connected with the navy ;’ that

‘warrant officers were shipped as in the merchant service ‘for the voyage;’ that ‘their connexion with the navy ‘terminated with the commission.’ Masters and surgeons were warrant officers; but from an early date in the eighteenth century they had half-pay, and were on a permanent list. Pursers, gunners, boatswains, and carpenters were warrant officers; but so far from being ‘shipped for the ‘voyage,’ so far from ‘their connexion with the navy terminating with the commission,’ they were ‘the particular ‘standing officers . . . so called for that they are warranted ‘by the Admiralty for each ship, during life, in case they ‘commit no misdemeanour worthy of their being turned ‘out.’*

The only authority which Mr. Hannay acknowledges is General Mundy’s Life; but with the personal narrative adapted from that, he has, in relating the latter and more important part of Rodney’s career, ably interwoven much of Captain Chevalier’s ‘*Histoire de la Marine française pendant la Guerre de l’Indépendance américaine.*’ Captain Chevalier is a most interesting writer, and perfectly trustworthy as far as the facts relating to the French navy are concerned; but he is by no means a valid authority for those that concern the English navy; and the blindly following his lead has rendered Mr. Hannay guilty of many serious and some grotesque blunders. With better effect he has used Rodney’s letters to the Duke of Newcastle, now in the British Museum. These have not before been printed, and the extracts which he gives are both interesting and valuable. We could very well have done with more, even if it had been necessary to make room for them by the omission of some of the theorising as to the status of warrant officers. He has also consulted an important volume of Hood’s correspondence, now in the British Museum; and has had access to some of the family papers. What seems, however, surprising, and cannot but be considered a grievous error, is his ignoring the official correspondence and the mass of official documents in the Public Record Office; in consequence of which he is frequently left speculating as to questions which admit of an easy answer. Thus, for instance, he quotes a letter from Rodney to the Duke of Newcastle, asking—as an electioneering job—that a Captain Peard should have post

* Maydman’s ‘*Naval Speculations and Maritime Politicks*’ (1691), p. 192.

rank, and adds, 'Whether Captain Peard had post I do not know, and it does not greatly matter;' probably, he thinks, he was preferred. A simple reference to a Navy List, or even to Charnock or Schoenberg, would have shown him that he was not. Similarly, he mentions the petition of some French prisoners, whose wives and children were ordered to be sent to Ostend, and prayed that they might be allowed to remain. 'What answer was given [sc. to the petition] I do not know,' says Mr. Hannay. But the petition, with Rodney's covering letter dated June 22, 1756, and the Admiralty minute, 'They must proceed agreeable to orders,' are all to be seen at no further expense of time or trouble than is involved in asking for them at the Record Office. These are not solitary instances. Many others might be adduced, and, though of very little consequence in themselves, they are important as evidence of a careless method of working which is poorly compensated for by a pleasant and intelligent style. And yet this does make amends for much. The book is eminently readable and will be read. Six months hence people will know more about Rodney and the navy of his time than they did six months ago; and if their knowledge has some alloy of error, so also, in all probability, has their knowledge of the navy as it is. It will be a distinct gain that many who are not to be reckoned as historical students should learn what manner of man Rodney was, what he did, and what tools he did it with; should learn how, in England's greatest distress—when she was racked by faction at home and war abroad; when even the navy, forced unwillingly to meddle with State affairs, was unable to prevent foreigners from fooling us—Rodney stemmed the tide of misfortune, and by a glorious victory restored our prestige and strengthened the hands of our diplomatists. This is what Mr. Hannay has told in not unfitting language; this is what, with his aid, we now propose to discuss.

George Brydges Rodney was descended from a younger branch of a stock which had been rooted at Stoke Rodney, in Somersetshire, for more than five hundred years. He was born in 1718, and according to family tradition received his Christian names from the King and the Duke of Chandos, who were his godfathers. He was about six months over fourteen when, in July 1732, he entered the navy on board the 'Sunderland,' of 60 guns, commanded by Captain Robert Man, as a 'king's letter boy,' or, in official language,

a 'volunteer per order.'* In May 1733 he joined the 'Dreadnought,' with the rating of 'able seaman.' The 'Dreadnought' was then commanded by Captain Alexander Geddes; but in November 1734 he was superseded by Captain Medley, who died vice-admiral and commander-in-chief in the Mediterranean, in 1747. By Medley, young Rodney was rated a midshipman, and with him he continued in the 'Dreadnought' for the next three years, employed first in the Mediterranean, and afterwards in the protection of the Newfoundland fisheries. In July 1739 he joined the 'Somerset,' of 80 guns, the flagship of Admiral Haddock, in the fleet off Cadiz. Here he again had the rating of 'able seaman,' till on October 29, 1739, he was promoted to be lieutenant of the 'Dolphin,' a small frigate, commanded by Lord Aubrey Beauclerk. This frequent alternation of ranks must appear curious to those who only know the rigid system of our own time. Mr. Hannay well remarks that—

'Nothing distinguished our ancestors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from their descendants of to-day more completely than their indifference to formal regularity in the organisation of the public services, and their tolerance of anomalies. As for organisation, they were satisfied with as little of it as would serve the turn and they endured anomalies with serene indifference as long as they were not intolerable in their practical results. . . . The getting of men, they held, was only possible by the strenuous application of patriotism, zeal for the King's service, and intelligence on the part of those who had to select. Therefore they were content to allow a great freedom of choice to those in authority.'

It was thus that, as a general rule, the captain of a ship-of-war took to sea with him as many young gentlemen as he liked. He was nominally restricted to four in every hundred of the ship's company: these were rated 'captain's servants,' and for them he drew provisions, or the money value in lieu, and the pay of 10*l.* a year; so that in a large ship the emolument accruing to him from this source was very considerable. Nor was there, as is sometimes supposed, anything underground about it. The rating was instituted, and the numbers determined in the time of Queen Elizabeth,† avowedly to enable officers to train up young men for the sea service;

* General Mundy, whom Mr. Hannay follows, says that he entered the navy two years earlier, with Captain Medley. This is an error. The date of the 'order' is June 21, 1732, and he joined the 'Sunderland' at Sheerness on July 7.

† State Papers, Domestic, Eliz. vol. 266, No. 86.

and when, in 1690, the captains' pay was doubled, and the number of servants reduced, they complained that they were losers by the change, and brought such a weight of interest to bear on the Admiralty, that the increase of pay was reduced, and the number of servants restored. It was only the captains who had the privilege to this great extent; but every officer, commissioned or warrant, was allowed a servant, whom he entered himself, not unfrequently a son or a brother.

But besides the servants formally sanctioned, the captain, by the practice of the navy, entered as many boys as he wished in any available rating; sometimes that of 'midshipman;' very often of 'able seaman;' it was a mere matter of convenience; the rating or disrating of a midshipman was entirely at the discretion or caprice of the captain. In the present day a midshipman is necessarily a gentleman by birth and education: in the last century this was not the case; he was a petty officer, of higher rank than other petty officers, but generally of the same social level: he was frequently married; he was frequently thirty, forty or even fifty years old; he was liable to be disgraced, and to be flogged by sentence of court martial. In 1779, one was hanged for murdering his mother, who was the bumboat woman; another, for plotting to murder the captain and officers, seize the ship and carry her into a French port. This last had been taken prisoner in an American ship, had said he was an Irishman, that his name was Murphy, and would volunteer for the King's service if he was put on the quarter deck. By the Admiralty instructions, it was ordered that a young man must have served two years as midshipman or master's mate before he could be made lieutenant; and consequently a youngster took care to get one or other of these ratings whenever opportunity occurred; but if there was no vacancy, then he served, more or less nominally, as 'able seaman.' It has just been said that Rodney was borne in the 'Dreadnought' for eighteen months as an 'able seaman:' Hawke, Jervis and Nelson were all 'able seamen' for part of their time. It is this that makes it absolutely impossible to say now how far the custom ever prevailed of promoting men 'from before the mast,' men who came in 'through the hawseholes.' Theoretically and nominally, every one was promoted from 'before the mast;' practically, promotion was restricted very nearly as much as it is now. Rodney and Hawke had both been serving as 'able seamen' just before they obtained their first commission; it certainly

never entered the head of any of their contemporaries to speak of them as having come in 'through the hawseholes.' They were, in fact, both of them so far exceptional as having entered the service as 'volunteers per order,' a distinction which probably insured their being appointed to some ship at the instance of the Admiralty. Jervis entered as an 'able seaman;' Knowles as a 'captain's servant;' so also—as every reader of Macaulay will remember—did Myngs, Narbrough and Shovell, in the previous century.

Rodney's promotion to the 'Dolphin' was confirmed in February 1740: in 1741 he was a lieutenant of the 'Essex,' one of the fleet in the Channel under Sir John Norris, and early in 1742 he was appointed to the 'Namur,' which was fitting as the flagship of Admiral Mathews in the Mediterranean. To be appointed lieutenant of a flagship was a direct step towards promotion, which lay then very much in the hands of the admiral; and accordingly, on November 9, 1742, Rodney was promoted to be captain of the 'Plymouth,' a 60-gun ship, under orders for England. On his arrival, the commission was confirmed by the Admiralty to the original date, thus permitting Rodney to jump over the intermediate rank of commander; no very unusual thing then, though now impossible except by Order in Council.

It was as a post captain, then, that in September 1743 Rodney was appointed to the command of the 'Sheerness,' a 24-gun frigate, which in the beginning of 1744 was attached to the fleet commanded by Sir John Norris—the fleet before which the French fled in dismay from Dungeness and out of the Channel on the night of February 24. Whether Rodney actually witnessed this flight is doubtful; that he heard plenty about it, and the comments on the French escape—which must have been the common talk of the fleet—is quite certain.

It is interesting, in looking down the list of this fleet,* to note the number of names known to history among the captains with whom Rodney must have been on more or less familiar terms. Martin, who, eighteen months before, had forced a declaration of neutrality from the King of Naples, was there, a rear-admiral and third in command. Medley, his old captain, was captain of the fleet; Boscawen was earning his *sobriquet* of 'Old Dreadnought;' Pocock, whom he was to meet again in the West Indies, was captain of the 'Sutherland;' Micheli, who had been round the world with

* Beatson's 'Naval and Military Memoirs,' vol. iii. p. 42.

Anson, was there in the 'Worcester;' and Saunders, so gloriously associated with Wolfe in the capture of Quebec, now commanded the 'Sapphire.' John Byng too was there, as captain of the 'St. George;' and Griffin, Mostyn and Brett, who were all to suffer in reputation next year for their unlucky chase of the 'Neptune' and 'Fleurion,' were in the fleet. So too was Richard Collins, who, twelve years before, had been a lieutenant of the 'Sunderland,' when Rodney joined her as a volunteer, and was now commander of the 14-gun sloop 'Grampus;' he was not posted till the following July. Elliot Elliott, whose name was surely devised as an orthographic crux, was commander of the fireship 'Ætna;' and Samuel Hood, whose future career was so closely connected with Rodney's, was at this time a midshipman with him in the 'Sheerness.'

In the October of 1744 Rodney was moved into the larger frigate 'Ludlow Castle,' taking Hood with him; and after fifteen months spent in North Sea cruising, he was appointed to fit out the 'Eagle,' a new 60-gun ship. Mr. Hannay, following General Mundy, describes him as, at this period, commanding the 'Centurion' for some time. This is a mistake; but it is a natural and very interesting one. The 'Centurion,' as a 60-gun ship, had carried Anson's broad pennant in his celebrated circumnavigation: on her return to England, she was found to be very crazy, and when being repaired was ordered to be reduced to a 50-gun ship, and to be named the 'Eagle;' while a new 'Centurion,' of 60 guns, was ordered to be built. With Anson at the Admiralty and on intimate terms with several of his old shipmates, sentimental objections very naturally prevailed, and when the new ship was ready for launching, she was ordered to be named the 'Eagle,' the name 'Centurion' being restored to the old ship.*

It was to the new 60-gun ship that Rodney was appointed on December 30, 1745;† but as the appointment must have been arranged some time before, it would appear, in his papers, as to the 'Centurion,' and his biographer was thus led into the mistake of supposing that he actually commanded the 'Centurion.' The fitting out and manning the 'Eagle' took nearly three months, and during the rest of the year

* Lord's 'Letter Books' (December 15, 1744), xxxviii. 253; and (November 15, 1745), xl. 98.

† His commission was antedated December 3. He was discharged from the 'Ludlow Castle' December 28.

he was principally engaged in cruising off the south coast of Ireland, then a favourite haunt of the enemy's privateers, where, only the previous year, one of them had captured the 40-gun ship 'Anglesea.' In 1747 he was called to more active service in the lucrative cruise under Commodore Fox, and in the more glorious one under Rear-Admiral Hawke. In speaking of this, Mr. Hannay incidentally pays Lord Anson a compliment to which he is very certainly not entitled. 'Lord Anson,' he says, 'selected the best officer he could have found in the navy to replace himself. A squadron of fourteen sail, with the "Eagle" among them, was collected at Plymouth and placed under the command of Rear-Admiral Edward Hawke.' But the officer that Anson appointed to the command was Sir Peter Warren. Hawke, who had just been promoted to his flag, was to command in the second post, under him. Fortunately—as we may now think—Warren's health broke down; he was unable to go to sea, and proposed that Hawke should take his place. So far from selecting Hawke for the command, Anson expressed great uneasiness 'about the ships being abroad under so young an officer;' * but he was on the spot, no one else was at hand, and the matter was urgent. It was thus almost of the nature of accident that Hawke was in command on October 14, when his squadron met the French under L'Étenduère broad off Rochefort. By some extraordinary and even astounding blunder, the headline of Mr. Hannay's page is printed: 'a drawn battle.' The result of this 'drawn battle' was that six out of eight French ships which remained to fight were captured; and that the greater part of the convoy, seeking its destination in the West Indies without an escort, was picked up by the squadron there, or by outlying cruisers. L'Étenduère did unquestionably display the utmost gallantry, and was nobly seconded by the several captains of his squadron; but nothing less like 'a drawn battle' is recorded in our naval annals.

In the honour of the day Rodney had a very full share. He was closely engaged, on the one side with the 'Neptune' of 70 guns, on the other with a second French ship, apparently the 'Fougueux' of 64 guns, and in the unequal conflict sustained great loss. He thought and said that at this juncture Captain Fox, of the 'Kent,' could and should have relieved him, and that his conduct in not doing so was deserving of the severest punishment. On this and other

* Burrows' 'Life of Hawke,' p. 176.

charges Fox was afterwards tried by court martial, and being found guilty of 'misconduct,' was 'dismissed from the command of the "Kent."' Fox is said to have been an old man with impaired sight, unable to make out the admiral's signals or to distinguish the movements of the ships. He was thus compelled to place undue dependence on the first lieutenant and the master—"two damned bad fellows, I verily believe," wrote Keppel, who was on the court martial: 'I firmly think him no coward, but an unsettled silly man, with a confused mind, but a good heart.' He was superannuated and died in 1763.

Independent of its bearing on the action of October 14, this court martial has another interest which has escaped Mr. Hannay. It was the custom, till then, to take the witnesses' depositions beforehand, thus opening a very wide door to irregularities, to leading questions, and occasionally to suggestion or intimidation. The law officers of the Admiralty now pronounced these illegal; and the trial of Captain Fox was the first held without them. Other changes in the procedure of courts martial were introduced by the Naval Discipline Act of 1749, but none of such importance or such immediate advantage as this, which took effect without public notice and probably without public knowledge.

After the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Rodney was appointed to the command of the 'Rainbow,' a 40-gun ship, and employed in the protection of the Newfoundland fisheries, with the high-sounding title of 'Governor of Newfoundland.' At that time, according to Mr. Hannay,

'We considered the place as a fishing station, and indeed it was little else. The fishermen and the fisheries were directly under "Admirals of the Fisheries," resident officers from whom there lay an appeal to the officers of his Majesty's ships on the coast. Other settlers were under justices, who, however, had no jurisdiction over the fisher folk. At the head of all was the chief naval officer on the station. So completely were the Fisheries considered as the colony, that the Governor only stayed there during the season to protect them. For the rest of the year he was doing convoy work out, and home, or was lying in the Longreach. He had a regular round specified to him with much precision.'

In spring he was to collect the fishing fleet from the several ports of the Channel, and escort them to the Banks. During the summer he was to keep pretty constantly at sea, looking out for interlopers or an occasional pirate.

'On October 1 he was to collect his charge, now fully laden with stock fish for the Peninsula and the Mediterranean, and was to convoy

them to Cadiz, whence after a stay of not more than ten or twelve days he was to see them, and such other merchant ships as put themselves under his protection, to their respective ports "as high as Livorno." After a stay of not more than twenty days, he was to return by Barcelona, Majorca, Minorca, Alicante, and Cadiz. From thence, after another delay limited to twelve days, he was to make his way, providing for the Lisbon and Oporto trade in person or by deputy, to the Downs. . . . At a later period the experience must have been invaluable to Rodney. When nearly thirty* years later he sailed to relieve Gibraltar, he must have found the value of the practice he had had in taking convoys in and out of the Mediterranean.

Very shortly after his first going out to his station, a private letter from Lord Sandwich warned him that he might expect to be called on to aid the colonists against the French encroachments in Nova Scotia—such as eventually brought on the Seven Years' War. If so, his compliance with their request would be approved. The letter continued:—

'It is judged improper, as yet, to send any public order upon a business of so delicate a nature, which is the reason of my writing to you in this manner, and I am satisfied your prudence is such as will not suffer you to make any injudicious use of the information you now receive. There are some people that cannot be trusted with any but public orders; but I have too good an opinion of you to rank you among them, and shall think this important affair entirely safe under your management and secrecy.'

Such a letter shows, as Mr. Hannay remarks, that Rodney's 'reputation must have been well established at head quarters as a capable officer.'

It was at this time that a uniform was first ordered for naval officers. Till then they dressed as they pleased, with—says Mr. Hannay—'a preference for red for show, and for grey—the colour of the slops served to the men—for work.' This may have been so, but the evidence of it is not stated, and it is scarcely borne out by the very numerous portraits which we saw at Chelsea last summer. There was indeed much diversity; but few or none in either red or grey. We doubt if Mr. Hannay is correct in saying that some naval officers 'petitioned for a uniform, and were told to choose. They asked for a blue uniform with red facings, or a red uniform with blue facings.' Sir John Barrow, writing with an intimate knowledge of the Admiralty records, ascribes the initiative to the Board of Admiralty,† though probably the

* It is printed 'twenty;' an obvious slip of the pen or the compositor.

† Life of Anson, p. 150.

matter had been a good deal discussed among the seniors. The portraits of Admirals Mathews and Smith in blue coats faced with red, and ample red waistcoats, support the opinion said to have been expressed by Admiral Forbes in favour of the colours which Mr. Hannay says naval officers petitioned for. The popular story has it that whilst the matter was under consideration, the King's fancy was caught by a blue and white riding habit of the Duchess of Bedford. This is not impossible, though it is not supported by any satisfactory evidence. On the other hand, a letter from Keppel to his friend Philip Saumarez, dated the 25th of August, 1747, has—

'Tim Brett tells me you have made a uniform coat &c. after your own fancy; my Lord Anson is desirous that many of us should make coats after our own tastes, and then that a choice should be made of one to be general; and if you will appear in it here, he says he will be answerable your taste will not be amongst the worst.' (P. 151.)

This seems to have been the dress finally approved of; for a portrait of Captain Saumarez, which was lent to the Naval Exhibition by Lord de Saumarez, represents him in the new uniform, though he was killed in the action of October 14, 1747, a year or more before it was authorised. Mr. Hannay thinks that 'the old navy uniform, the blue coat relieved 'with white and gold, the white knee breeches and stockings, 'was one of the most becoming ever worn.' The family portraits of Anson and John Byng which were lent to the Guelph and Naval Exhibitions quite warrant this judgement.

The 'Rainbow' was paid off in the autumn of 1752, and early in 1753 Rodney married Miss Compton, niece of the Earl of Northampton. For the next two years he commanded a guardship at Portsmouth, being transferred from one to the other, from the 'Kent' to the 'Fougueux,' from the 'Fougueux' to the 'Prince George,' and from her to the 'Monarch,' according to the requirements of the time. From the 'Monarch' Rodney was moved in February 1757 to the 'Dublin.' There is a tragic interest attaching to the name of the 'Monarch' at this time. On March 17,

'poor Byng, having now no need to think and act, but only to undergo his fate, faced the firing party on the "Monarch's" quarter-deck like a gentleman, without fear and without ostentation. Rodney had no share, direct or indirect, in the trial or execution of the admiral, but I have come to a very mistaken estimate of his character if he disapproved it.'

So Mr. Hannay. When the court martial was settled, Rodney was on leave in London, but was ordered to return to Portsmouth in order to sit. He replied that his health was so bad as to render it impossible for him to set out for Portsmouth: he had not been out of doors for several days, and was 'constantly attended by a physician.' There is no reason to doubt that he was really ill 'with a violent bilious 'cholic;' but it may very well be that he was in no hurry to get better in order to take part in a duty that, however righteous, could not fail to be exceedingly unpleasant. In the autumn of 1757 the 'Dublin' was in the Bay of Biscay with Hawke, and in the following summer was with Boscawen on the coast of North America. In the success of the year, however, she had little share: she was excessively sickly, and spent the greater part of the season at Halifax. In 1759 Rodney was promoted to be rear-admiral. It was the year of great events, the 'wonderful year,' and Rodney got his flag, in May, just in time to be able to add his little independent quota. In July, while Saunders and Wolfe were preparing to take Quebec, while Boscawen was keeping watch over Toulon, and Hawke was on guard before Brest, Rodney, with his flag in the 'Achilles,' had command of a small squadron, with some bombs, off Havre de Grace. There the French had collected a number of flat-bottomed boats, such as were referred to in the song of the year. It was for Rodney to take care that in darkness or in daylight they should not get over; and he put an end to the possibility of their doing so by destroying them. Mr. Hannay says: 'Havre was bombarded with success, and numbers of 'flat-bottomed boats were destroyed, together with great 'quantities of the stores collected for the proposed invasion. 'The destruction can hardly have been complete, and was 'probably not even so extensive as the English supposed. It 'was enough, however, to deal the French a shrewd blow.' At any rate Havre had no further part in the projected operations; and though Rodney continued on the coast for more than a year, he had little opportunity of further distinction.

During all these later years he had been member of Parliament for one or other of the close boroughs in the gift of the Government. Mr. Hannay aptly points out that, at that time, it was the custom for every naval officer of any social or professional eminence to go into Parliament; it was, according to the spirit of the age, essential to his advancement.

‘A naval officer who was also a member had, in the first place, a much better chance of obtaining a command than another, and, in the second, was much more likely to be well backed up when he was in it. The possession of a vote which might be used to support or annoy a minister, would give him an independent position, or at least a claim. The calculation was a convincing one, and therefore his Majesty’s sea officers went into the House as much as they could. . . . The Treasury and Admiralty made a similar calculation for their part. If it was convenient for a naval officer to have a seat, it was equally useful to ministers that many members should belong to a body of gentlemen who might be soothed by the prospect of command, or kept in order by fear of the loss of place. Naval officers were therefore commonly chosen as Treasury candidates for dockyard seats, or for the pocket boroughs in the West.’

It was thus that in 1751 Rodney had been returned for Saltash, as the nominee of Cleveland, the Secretary of the Admiralty. Afterwards circumstances, and probably the Compton interest in Hampshire, brought him into direct communication with the Duke of Newcastle, by whom, in 1759, he was nominated for the representation of Okehampton. As a member of the House, Rodney’s function was limited to voting as was best suited to his own and his sponsor’s interests. ‘A steady adherence,’ he wrote, ‘to your Grace’s commands shall ever distinguish me while I have a seat in the House;’ but how far he carried out the promise is unknown. Mr. Hannay considers the tone of Rodney’s letters to the Duke as unduly subservient, and emphasises his meaning by quoting the conclusion of the letter just referred to: ‘I have the honour to be, with the utmost respect and Gratitude, your Grace’s most devoted and most obedient humble servant, G. B. Rodney.’ He might have quoted some still stronger. Here, for instance, is one: ‘Among your Grace’s many friends you shall find none more ready to obey your commands than him who has the honour to be, with the most profound respect, humility, and gratitude, your Grace’s most obliged and most obedient humble servant.’ It is easy to lay too much stress on these exaggerated forms, which were the fashion of the day; and, indeed, the very letter of November 27, 1760, from which we have just quoted, shows that the obligation was not all on one side. George II. was recently dead; a general election was at hand; and Rodney wrote:—

‘I must beg leave to acknowledge the very great obligations I lay under to your Grace for all the preferments I have attained in the Navy—obligations which I can never forget, and which now call upon me most humbly to offer what little interest I have in the county of

Southampton, to be disposed of at your Grace's pleasure, as 'tis whispered in this county there is a likelihood of an opposition at the ensuing election.'

The pride that aped humility was not unknown even then ; and it was no more a mark of subservience in Rodney to profess his 'profound respect' for the Duke of Newcastle than it was of undue familiarity in one of the princes to sign himself, according to the usual royal formula, his correspondent's 'affectionate friend.' The general election came on in March 1761, and Rodney, by the joint interest of the Duke and Lord Falmouth, was returned for Penryn. A few months later he was appointed Commander-in-Chief on the Leeward Islands station, where he remained till the peace in 1763. The French had, however, been completely beaten from the sea, and the work which the navy had before it was mainly that of co-operating with the army in the reduction of Martinique and the other French islands, or in the greater expedition against Havana. Mr. Hannay appears to undervalue the work done at Martinique, although that island had repulsed a formidable attack in 1759, and its capture now 'astonished all Europe.' Nor was the operation by any means conducted by the army alone: a very full share of it fell to the navy. A letter from one of the military officers, after speaking of the construction of the batteries, goes on:—

'All the cannon and other warlike stores were landed as soon as possible and dragged by the *Jacks* to any point thought proper. You may fancy you know the spirit of these fellows, but to see them in action exceeds any idea that can be formed of them. A hundred or two of them, with ropes and pulleys, will do more than all your dray horses in London. Let but their tackle hold, and they will draw you a cannon or mortar on its proper carriage up to any height, though the weight be never so great. It is droll enough to see them tugging along with a good twenty-four pounder at their heels; on they go, huzzang and hallooing, sometimes uphill, sometimes downhill; now sticking fast in the brakes, presently floundering in the mud and mire; swearing, blasting, damning, sinking, and as careless of everything but the matter committed to their charge as if death or danger had nothing to do with them. We had a thousand of these brave fellows sent to our assistance by the admiral; and the service they did us, both on shore and on the water, is incredible.' *

There are, of course, many who have seen the same kind of work performed by our seamen in the Crimea, in India, or in Egypt; but the afternoon drills at Chelsea last

* Feb. 10, 1762: Mundy's 'Life of Rodney,' i. 74.

summer, which were witnessed by hundreds of thousands of stay-at-home citizens, were a very good illustration of it. After the conquest of Martinique, the news of the Spanish war opened to Rodney visions of a service in which profit and duty would be pleasantly combined; and, being a poor man, he naturally felt aggrieved by the arrival of Sir George Pocock, with a large fleet, to supersede him from the chief command. The capture of Havana, which brought to Pocock upwards of 120,000*l.* prize money, and 25,000*l.* to Keppel, the second in command, must have been bitterness to Rodney, left at Martinique; and the more so, as he had no ostensible reason for complaint. It was in ordinary course for a command of such importance and value to be given to an officer of higher rank than a rear-admiral; and Pocock was not only Rodney's senior, but had a much higher reputation than Rodney's yet was. The influence of Newcastle, too, was no longer paramount, and it may have well been that there was, at home, a feeling of satisfaction in snubbing one who must have been ranked as his *protégé*. However, on returning to England, Rodney's service was acknowledged by the grant of a baronetcy; and two years later he was appointed Governor of Greenwich Hospital, where he remained for some five years. It was at this time that the celebrated greatcoat incident is said to have occurred. The story is that in his first winter at Greenwich Sir George ordered greatcoats for the pensioners far in excess of what was usual, or necessary, in the opinion of Captain Boys, the Lieutenant-Governor. Accordingly, in a meeting of the Council, Boys 'represented the Governor's conduct 'as extremely reprehensible;' whereupon Rodney, eyeing Boys with 'a mixture of surprise, indignation, and contempt,' replied:—

'I have the greatest respect for you as a man who, by the greatest merit, has raised himself from the station of a foremast man to the rank of an admiral—a circumstance which not only does you the highest honour, but &c. &c. . . . There are very few young sailors that come to London without paying Greenwich Hospital a visit; and it shall be the rule of my conduct, as far as my authority extends, to render the old men's lives so comfortable that the younger shall say when he goes away, "Who would not be a sailor to live as happy as a prince in his old age?"'

The story has been often repeated, and is given by Mr. Hannay as substantially true. But Boys was of a respectable family, long settled in the neighbourhood of Deal; a family which—including those of its own name, and its cousins, the

Bretts and the Harveys—has given perhaps more officers to the navy, during the past hundred and fifty years, than any family in England. After being mate of a merchant ship, he entered the navy as a midshipman; he could no more be described as ‘rising from the station of a foremast man’ than Rodney himself; and as he never attained ‘the rank of an ‘admiral,’ he could not possibly be addressed as such by Rodney. But as the prologue of the speech is demonstrably false, we may doubt if credence is to be attached to any part of it, or if Mr. Hannay has any better right to speak of Boys as ‘a naval Bumble,’ who ‘richly deserved his snubbing’—if indeed he got it—than he has to speak of him as ‘an ‘officer who had come in through the hawsehole.’ It is not only with reference to Captain Boys that Mr. Hannay has written disparagingly, without due consideration. The Hospital—he says—was at this time ‘a hotbed of the dirtiest ‘conceivable jobbery and thieving of the lowest type of the ‘eighteenth century.’ The fact is that he has accepted Captain Baillie’s account of the state of things in 1775, under the administration of Lord Sandwich, as equally referring to that from 1765 to 1770, under Lord Hawke. That there were abuses even then is highly probable; but the serious charges which were made and proved against Lord Sandwich were never even implied against Lord Hawke, whose term of office at the Admiralty was synchronous with that of Rodney at Greenwich. Hawke was superseded by Sandwich in January 1771, and within a few weeks Rodney was appointed to the Jamaica command.

It was during this long spell on shore that Rodney incurred that load of debt which so terribly hampered him during the following ten years. He had never been wealthy; but as a bachelor and continually at sea, with some prize money, he had managed fairly well. His marriage with Miss Compton had probably brought him some dower; but she had died in 1757; and with his second wife, whom he married in 1764, he appears to have received no other riches than domestic happiness and a continually increasing family. He was, too, fond of society; and society at that time meant frequent card playing, not always for nominal stakes. The Duchess of Bedford’s assemblies are particularly named as the wreck of many fortunes. But the extravagance which was his financial ruin was a contested election at Northampton in 1768. He felt the professional necessity of being in Parliament; but neither Newcastle nor any other friend was in a position to nominate him to a close borough, and the

price of the article, in the open market, had gone up enormously. The general election of 1768 was notorious for its unblushing corruption; and Northampton was unwilling to be behind the age. Rodney was elected, but at a cost estimated, in the gossip of the day, at 30,000*l*.*

With the prospect of a war with Spain, the command at Jamaica meant the prospect of much prize money, and to Rodney of relief from pressing difficulties; and Lord Sandwich was, doubtless, quite sensible of the value of what he was giving. It had been the custom for the Governor of Greenwich Hospital, on accepting a seagoing command, to hold it in addition to the governorship; and Rodney requested that what had been permitted to Jennings and to Balchen might be permitted to him. He reminded Sandwich that the Government owed him some compensation for the disappointment and loss to which he had been subjected in 1762. Sandwich, however, was deaf alike to the voice of argument and friendship. Spendthrift as he was in many respects, he was by no means the man to squander patronage, and Rodney on hoisting his flag was at once superseded at Greenwich. Nor did the command prove a satisfactory equivalent; for the dispute with Spain blew over and left the Admiral without opportunity for distinction or emolument. The commission passed away with little excitement beyond a sharp correspondence with the Governor of Cartagena as to the conduct of the *guarda-costas*; and though Rodney hoped that on the death of Sir William Trelawny he might succeed as Governor of Jamaica, in that, too, he was disappointed. He considered that he had a claim on the Government; that, having deeply involved himself in contesting an election in the interests of the ministry, it was for them to reimburse him, especially when they could do so without loss to themselves or detriment to the public service. Mr. Hannay thinks that the ministers had formed the opinion that Rodney's day was past; that a man whose embarrassments would not permit him to live in England might be dropped with safety and even advantage. It is not surprising, then, that in the summer of 1774—

'Rodney returned to England an embittered and disappointed man, believing and saying that he had been treated with gross ingratitude. . . . To be dropped as useless can be pleasant to no man, and therefore it is not wonderful that Rodney was savage and cursed the ingratitude of

* Lord Chesterfield to his Son, April 12, 1768. The date, in connexion with Rodney, is an interesting coincidence.

politicians. For the moment, however, there was nothing for it but to beat a retreat. At the close of 1774, or very early in the following year . . . he betook himself to the Continent to economise and set up his quarters in Paris. It is, of course, needless to say that, whatever he did in the capital of France, he did not economise. . . . By 1778 he had, without, as it would seem, shaking off his English claims, contracted French debts to a considerable amount.'

Mr. Hannay omits to say that his immediate embarrassment was caused by the action of the Navy Board, which for some unexplained reason—possibly, his being absent in France—refused to allow his pay as Rear-Admiral of England, to which office he had been promoted during the period of his Jamaica command. 'If they'—the Admiralty—he wrote to his wife on April 1, 'would order the Navy Board to deliver but half of what is due to me as Rear-Admiral of England, it would be sufficient to satisfy everybody, and there would be money to spare besides.' It was at this time, when war between France and England was imminent, and when Rodney, deeply in debt in Paris, could obtain no help from the boon companion of former years, whose position at the Admiralty would have rendered it easy, that after several refusals he accepted Maréchal Biron's offer to advance whatever was necessary to relieve him from the intolerable position in which he was placed. The story is told, in very full detail, by Rodney himself in his letters to his wife, and is thus beyond the possibility of doubt: the sum actually advanced was 1,000 louis. Another story, that offers of high rank and command in the French navy were made to him on the part of the French Government, has probably grown out of a misrepresentation of the former. It is not supported by any evidence; and though General Mundy says 'it is generally credited in the Admiral's own family,' and Mr. Hooper, in the excellent article in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' wrote that the fact 'is undeniable,' we agree with Mr. Hannay, who pronounces it 'a wild legend which can hardly have even a basis of fact.'

Some months before his escape from France, Rodney had formally offered his services to the Admiralty, but had received no other answer than the official acknowledgement. With the course of events during the next two years to guide us, it is not easy to understand why Sandwich turned a deaf ear to the earnest requests of one whom he had called a friend, and gave appointments—for instance—to Keppel, who had never aspired to that honour. Two explanations offer themselves: firstly, Sandwich's natural inclination to betray

a friend when he thought there was nothing further to be got out of him; and secondly, the suggestion made to Keppel himself by the Duke of Richmond: 'If he has but a bad fleet to send out, 'tis doing Lord Sandwich no injustice to suppose he would be glad to put it under the command of a man whom he does not love, and yet whose name will justify the choice to the nation.' If we combine the two, it probably does no more than justice to the First Lord's idiosyncrasy. Rodney had, however, quite ceased to consider himself as a friend of Lord Sandwich, and in his intimate letters from Paris frankly expressed his satisfaction at the rumours—unfortunately false—which reached him of Sandwich's fall.

'We hear,' he wrote to Lady Rodney on April 1, 'of a change in administration. I hope it is true, and that I may have a chance of being employed, should the Duke of Grafton or Lord Shelburne be at the Admiralty;' and again on April 11: 'I sincerely hope Lord Chatham will be minister, and another First Lord of the Admiralty be appointed.' In May he returned to England, and—placing no dependence on the Admiralty—pushed what interest he had with the King himself. There was, however, no command then vacant, and he presumably had no assistance from the Admiralty. It was not till, by his behaviour to Keppel and Howe, Lord Sandwich had drawn on himself the outspoken indignation of every other admiral of any credit in the service, that towards the end of 1779 he accepted the King's personal recommendation of Rodney and appointed him to the West Indian command. Mr. Hannay thinks that Rodney's chief merit in the eyes of the King was the soundness of his political opinions. 'He was a Tory.' It is very doubtful whether he can be so called. 'He can hardly,' Mr. Hannay continues, 'have been a Tory when he was writing the letters quoted above to Newcastle.' We might add that he can hardly have been a Tory when he was writing to his wife on April 1 and 11, 1778; or from the West Indies on May 27, 1780,—

'Had the ministers suffered me to have taken the copper-bottomed ships with me that attended me to Gibraltar, the French fleet had been no more. . . . What are they about? Are they determined to undo their country? . . . What right had the administration to expect anything but defeat? . . . The whole truth shall be told in my public letters, and let the blame lie where it ought. Thank God, I now fear no frowns of ministers, and hope never again to stand in need of their assistance. I know them well. All are alike, and no dependence is to be placed on their promises.'

The fact seems to be that Rodney's politics were partly naval and partly personal. 'To keep foreigners from fooling us' was his prevailing idea; with advantage to himself and family, as a very good second; and there can be little doubt that at this time his plan for the furtherance of both was by attaching himself to the King. He recognised the State as a ship, and was prepared to give officer-like obedience to the King as her captain. The revolted colonists were mutineers, and as such he was free in his expressions against them, not as a Tory, but as an officer of the ship. If political principles were to be gauged by his personal feelings towards Lord Sandwich, he was as good a Whig as Keppel or Burke, or Charles James Fox himself. It does not appear that any choice of station was now offered him; but, in any case, he would probably have preferred the West Indies, which he knew more of than any other officer of the day. It was, however, not only to the West Indies that he had to go. A very important service had first to be performed. For six months Gibraltar had been besieged by a Spanish army, and blockaded by a Franco-Spanish fleet. It could only be relieved by force, and the duty was entrusted to Rodney. After many delays—delays of contractors, of merchants, of weather—he got to sea in the last days of December, with a fleet of twenty-one sail of the line, besides frigates, and upwards of 300 store ships.

To the southward of Cape St. Vincent, on January 16, 1780, he caught the Spanish Gibraltar squadron under the command of Don Juan de Langara, the same who fourteen years later was associated with Hood in the occupation of Toulon. Langara had now with him only eleven ships of the line, and of these, two were hull-down to the eastward; the other nine were making for Cadiz with a fair wind. Rodney had learnt from Hawke what to do under such circumstances. He at once ordered a general chase, the ships to get between the enemy and the land, and to engage as they came up with them. Night closed in as the action began, and through it a fearful storm was raging; but neither darkness nor storm stayed the brilliant rush of the English fleet, and the completeness of the result was commensurate with the vigour of the attack. Of the nine ships engaged, two only escaped; one was blown up; six, including the flagship, were captured; and Gibraltar was successfully relieved. The disproportion between the forces was so great as to deprive the action of much of its interest; but the peculiar circumstances of it—the darkness, the storm and

the rocks to leeward—enhanced the merit of the Admiral's prompt decision, which was loudly contrasted, by the minister's friends at home, with the more restrained action of 'cautious Leeshore.' The comparison was, no doubt, as invalid as the name applied to Keppel was absurd; but, such as it was, it caught the fancy of a populace which, through the last eighteen months, had had a surfeit of leeks, and Rodney was the hero of the hour, 'the first man in his profession and the most popular man in England.' As an official reward, he was nominated an extra Knight of the Bath; but to those who can now see behind the scenes, who know what Sandwich's share in Rodney's appointment was, and that Rodney knew what it was, it is amusing to read the eagerness with which he took to himself the credit of the action. Mr. Hannay scarcely does justice to the sublime impudence of the man who could write to Rodney: 'The worst of my enemies now allow that I have pitched upon a man who knows his duty, and is a brave, honest, and able officer.'

From Gibraltar the bulk of the fleet returned to England under Admiral Digby. Rodney, with four sail of the line, went on to the West Indies, which was to be the theatre of his glory. The description with which Mr. Hannay introduces it is one of his happiest efforts:—

'To understand a general's fighting, it is necessary to get some idea of his field of battle. The lay historian commonly remembers this well enough when he is dealing with battles on shore, but whether because he does not understand them, or discourteously thinks his readers cannot, he takes no account of the conditions in sea fights; yet they are every whit as important and as intelligible. What the hill, the river, and the wood were to Napoleon or Wellington, the wind, the current, and the lie of the land were to Rodney or Nelson. They were obstacles to be avoided or advantages to be used. Rodney's field of battle lay in the Lesser Antilles, the long string of small islands stretching over six degrees of latitude from north to south, which form the eastern division of the West Indies. . . . In 1780 these were divided among England, France, and Holland. To them, considerations, physical and political, limited the area of the war.'

He goes on to describe in some detail the trade wind blowing continuously from east to west, and the induced surface current setting in the same direction.

'Wind and wave together have worn the windward or easterly side of the Lesser Antilles bare. All the harbours are on the leeward or western side, looking into the Caribbean Sea. Wind and current alike tend to force all ships navigating the Antilles to the westward. When this pressure from the east is taken off, it is by a force which suspends

all his labours, whether of peace or war, and sends man crouching into the first place of safety he can find. From the end of July to the end of September are the hurricane months. While they last, no sailing fleets cared to keep the sea. They lay in harbour or went elsewhere.'

Mr. Hannay is thus quite correct in speaking of the Lesser Antilles as 'the gates of the West Indies,' through which lay the road from Europe. 'Whoever held them could run down, whenever he chose, on the Western Islands.' He is not correct in saying that the road to Europe lay through them, or that 'ships coming from the west must work up into the wind by weary tacking.' Such a mode of navigation is and was practically impossible. The road to Europe from Jamaica lay through the windward passage, east of Cuba, or through the Gulf of Florida to the west; and a ship having to go from Jamaica to the Lesser Antilles would run to the north in the same way, until able to sail to the east without the 'weary tacking' that Mr. Hannay speaks of. It is one of the many instances of 'the longest way round, the shortest way home.' Mr. Hannay has in this fallen into a natural geographical error. He has fallen into an historical error when he says: 'Therefore the conquest of the Lesser Antilles was looked upon as the necessary preliminary to an attack on the Greater, and so before the French would risk an attack on Jamaica, they must first drive us out of the positions of advantage to windward.' But Mr. Hannay knows perfectly well that in 1782 the French had every intention of risking an attack on Jamaica, and did, in fact, make the first movement towards it, without driving, or seriously attempting to drive, us from our windward position at St. Lucia. But the intention, followed as it was by the first movement, proved fatal to them, and Mr. Hannay has very well told how, giving, in fact, an extreme instance of the danger which—as Captain Mahan and Admiral Colomb have pointed out—a commander incurs who aims at 'ulterior objects' by eluding instead of smashing the enemy's fleet.

It so happened that both English and French fleets in the West Indies changed their admirals at the same time; that a few days before Rodney arrived at St. Lucia, the Comte de Guichen had arrived at Martinique.* Each admiral had a high reputation in his own service, and the campaign assumed to some extent the appearance of a match between the two. In numbers and in position the two fleets were

* The dates were March 22 and 27 respectively.

fairly equal. The head quarters of the French were in the magnificent harbour and bay of Fort Royal in Martinique; those of the English in the immediate neighbourhood, at St. Lucia, with two landlocked harbours and the admirable roadstead of Gros Islet Bay. Between the two, as strategic positions, there was little to choose. As to the comparative quality of the forces, we agree with Mr. Hannay that it is 'a question not so easy to settle.'

'In that respect Rodney ought, if our rather complacent belief in the natural superiority of the British navy is well grounded, to have had an overwhelming advantage. As a matter of fact, however, the superiority of our fleet was by no means what it became later on, and was to remain all through the next war. The French navy was at its best, and that best was very good. On all modern principles it should have been by far the better of the two. It was much the more carefully organised and schooled. From just before the end of the Seven Years' War till the beginning of this, the French Government had worked very hard at its fleet, and with very creditable results. . . . The education of the French naval officers was very thorough. They themselves were, for the most part, younger sons of noble houses—gentlemen, in short, with the traditional gallantry of their class. . . . Among them were some of the best officers who ever served any king. They had studied their profession hard, and had thought much more of the military part of it than English naval officers. It is a fact which the reader may think creditable or not, that the technical treatises, whether on seamanship or tactics, used by English officers, were mostly translated from the French. The crews of the French ships were formed either of carefully drilled land-men, or of the fishermen who were swept into the navy by the *inscription maritime*. At the beginning of the war they were very well drilled and efficient.'

Mr. Hannay then goes on to consider certain drawbacks. The high birth and social equality of the French officers was, he says, prejudicial to discipline. As he gives no authority for this statement, which is virtually contradicted by every French writer on the subject, it is impossible to attach much weight to it. That referring to the men is more serious and better attested. The number of seamen in France was too small to endure the strain of a continuous war; and the disastrous cruise in the Channel in 1779 had exhausted the supply. Captain Chevalier tells us the same thing; that Guichen was compelled to fill up his ships' companies with soldiers, of whom he had an unusually large proportion; and that 'the number of officers, which was scanty enough at the beginning of hostilities, had become quite insufficient.' The greater then the merit of the Admiral and of those that remained, who, during the passage out, so worked this not

very promising raw material, that on their arrival in the West Indies, the English, seeing that 'they manœuvred 'with their fleet, in style of seamanship, very superior to 'what they had ever before exhibited in any war in which 'they had been engaged,' came to the conclusion that they had a great many American sailors on board.* It does not, in fact, appear that they had any. This, however, was exceptional. The difficulty unquestionably affected the whole French navy, while 'the English navy, drawing its 'men from a vast maritime population, and entirely un-'limited in its choice of officers, was steadily getting more 'efficient.'

There was little pause before the comparison between admirals and fleets was brought to a practical test. On April 13 Guichen put to sea, with the object of bringing in a convoy expected at St. Domingo, and of afterwards attacking Barbadoes or any other of the English islands that opportunity might suggest. The uncertainty of the wind under the lee of Martinique delayed him for a couple of days, and he was still struggling to get to windward of Dominica when, on the 16th, Rodney came in sight. He had weighed from Gros Islet Bay as soon as he heard of Guichen's having sailed, and, being slightly favoured by the wind, obtained the weather gage without a struggle. By the morning of the 17th, the two fleets were abreast of and parallel to each other, though heading in opposite directions—the French towards the south, the English towards the north, some ten or twelve miles to windward. Ninety years before this time Admiral Russell had given out an order of battle, founded in great measure on the experience of the past fifty years in battles with the Dutch in the narrow seas. Rooke had afterwards repeated it, and had fought the battle of Malaga in accordance with it; and from that time it had been formally adopted by the Admiralty as Article XIX. of the Fighting Instructions. It became a positive order, without room for exception, that if the fleet was to windward of the enemy, ranged in line of battle, the van was to engage the van, and so on, the whole length of the line. For a violation of this order, Mathews had been cashiered; for not giving effect to it Byng had been shot; by attempting it the next year Graves was defeated and the American colonies were lost. No more fatal lines were ever penned. To disobey the order might prove fatal to the individual; to obey it

* Beatson's 'Naval and Military Memoirs,' vol. v. p. 65.

must almost necessarily prove disastrous to the nation. But no such objection to the order had ever been formulated; and many officers, brought up from youth in reliance on the Fighting Instructions, had learnt to believe in them as the utmost advancement of naval tactics, and were unable to understand any departure from them.

Two days previously Rodney 'had, either by oral or written communication, acquainted each captain in his fleet that it was his intention to attack that of the enemy; not their entire fleet of twenty-three sail with his inferior one of twenty, but a part of theirs, as, for example, fifteen or sixteen, with his whole fleet;' so that when, early in the morning of the 17th, he made the signal that he intended to attack the enemy's rear, he conceived that his meaning was patent to everyone. Unfortunately several signals and manœuvres intervened, and both fleets were on the same tack, heading to the north, when, a few minutes before noon, the order to engage was finally given. By that time the admiral and captains in the van had quite forgotten the previous order to attack the rear, and the communication, made two days before, which they had never understood. The result was thus exceeding disappointment. Rodney felt that he had Guichen in his grasp. The French, probably on account of the inexperience of the officers and men, were in very open order; their line extended to something like twelve miles; and he had thus the chance of falling with his whole force on half of that of the enemy. But Captain Carkett, who commanded the leading ship, and Rear-Admiral Parker, who commanded the van, could not understand anything beyond the fatal Article XIX. and stretched ahead to seek the enemy's van. Others followed their example; and others again, between the contradictory signals of Rodney and Parker, were completely fogged and did nothing. So that, instead of the brilliant victory which Rodney had pictured to himself, the result was a partial engagement, in which several of the ships on either side were much shattered, in which many men were killed or wounded, but in which no advantage was obtained by either party.

Rodney was naturally much annoyed at the failure, and in his letter to the Admiralty laid the blame freely on several of the captains, and especially on Carkett. It may, how-

* Letter from Sir Gilbert Blane, in the 'Athenæum,' Feb. 19, 1809.

ever, be doubted whether the cause did not rest mainly with himself. He was proposing an entirely novel mode of attack; he knew how completely the Fighting Instructions represented the tactical knowledge of his officers; but he took no sufficient means to explain to them what his purpose was. We do not know the exact wording of the communication made to Parker or to Carkett two days before the battle, and cannot be sure how far it really embodied the meaning which Rodney thought it did. It is, at any rate, quite certain that neither Parker nor Carkett understood it in the sense that Rodney intended; and, in fact, Carkett afterwards wrote to the Admiralty, in explanation of his conduct, that 'it is impossible to obey the signal to attack 'the enemy's rear and the signal to attack your opponent' [sc. "that ship of the enemy which it is your lot to "engage"], both at the same time, when the fleets are in 'two parallel lines and abreast of each other.' In this, as we think, lay Rodney's fault. It was the first necessity of his plan to make sure that those understood it who would have to execute it. In attempting such a startling innovation he was bound to take at least the flag officers into his confidence. And this he did not do. Neither Parker nor Rowley knew anything more of his meaning than Carkett or Bateman. It might have been done in the way of good fellowship. With his friends Rodney could talk freely enough; but, says Mr. Hannay—

'He lived apart from his captains, whom he generally regarded as his social inferiors, neither asking for their friendship nor giving them his; asking only for that implicit obedience which he was ready to render to his own official superiors. As a natural consequence he got obedience, but he won none of that loyal devotion which bound Collingwood or Hallowell or Hoste to Nelson. His relations to his subordinates were always strained. They knew that he expected them to act only on his order, therefore they would do just what they were ordered and nothing more. . . . To say that he could not temper command by good fellowship, that he could order but could not inspire, is to say that he had not the genial temperament of the very greatest stamp of leader, of a Nelson or of a Gustavus Adolphus. . . . To that race Rodney did not belong.'

Consequently he lost the opportunity which, had it been seized, would have placed him in the highest rank. And Guichen was determined not to give him a second opportunity of the same kind. Hitherto, during the century, the French admirals, having mastered the secret of our XIXth Article, preferred taking the lee gage whenever a battle was

imminent : they found it the position best suited for defence against the prescribed mode of attack. But Rodney had shown that he did not mean to adhere slavishly to the Fighting Instructions, and Guichen was quick to realise that, under such circumstances, the lee gage might be a position of unexpected danger. Accordingly, a month later, when the fleets were again in presence of each other, to windward of Martinique, Guichen obstinately retained the weather gage which fortune gave him ; and thus, though Rodney was twice able to lay up to his rear and bring on a passing skirmish, or, as he called it, a ‘re encounter,’ no battle took place, because he had not then learnt the theory of ‘breaking the line,’ which was so much talked of a couple of years later. And so the campaign ended, with no advantage to either, but with increased reputation to both ; it had shown tactical manœuvring of the highest class ; and if Guichen gave a chance, if Rodney missed it, this was probably not understood by any but the two admirals themselves, nor indeed by the former till he saw that it was missed. Even now, we know that Guichen’s mistake was caused by circumstances which he had endeavoured to correct, but not with complete success ; that Rodney’s failure was due to faults of temperament rather than of genius ; and the story of the campaign stands as one of the most interesting chapters in the history of naval tactics, a chapter worthy of being examined in minute detail by every student of the art.

A couple of months later Guichen returned to Europe, while Rodney, doubtful if he had not rather gone to the coast of North America, went himself to join Vice-Admiral Arbuthnot at New York. There his reception was extraordinary, Arbuthnot behaving with an insolence and insubordination unparalleled in an officer of his rank. That not only professional jealousy but the loss of prize money was at the bottom of the strange quarrel, there can be no doubt. Rodney took what prize money came to him, as a matter of course ; but there is no reason to suppose—as Arbuthnot did suppose—that his action was mainly dictated by his greed. It appears quite clear that Rodney’s leading motive was the good of the service, and if Guichen had indeed come on the coast, as his successor did in the next summer, nothing but Rodney’s presence could have saved our interests from a very great disaster. As it was, he pushed conciliation towards Arbuthnot to an almost extreme degree, till, finding that Arbuthnot refused to be conciliated, he referred the matter to the Admiralty, and having satisfied himself that

he was no longer needed in North American waters, he returned to the West Indies, where he arrived in the beginning of December.

Towards the end of the month he was joined by a large reinforcement which came out under the command of Rear-Admiral Sir Samuel Hood, the same who had been a midshipman with him in the 'Sheerness' and 'Ludlow Castle,' and had, as a young captain, served under his orders in the bombardment of Havre and in the subsequent operations on the coast of Normandy. A few weeks later he received news of the declaration of war with Holland, and a recommendation to let his first blow fall on St. Eustatius. This quite coincided with Rodney's own wishes. The contraband and partial trade of St. Eustatius had been an annoyance and a grievance to him during the whole of the past year; and now, with the utmost alacrity, he seized on the island and its vast accumulation of merchandise to the value of from two to three millions sterling. The atmosphere of this enormous wealth seems to have intoxicated him. A large proportion of it belonged to English merchants, and against these Rodney was especially furious; they were traitors who had been gathering riches by supplying the enemies of their country with contraband of war. 'My happiness,' he wrote to Germain, 'is having been the instrument of my country 'in bringing this nest of villains to condign punishment. 'They deserve scourging, and they shall be scourged.' Unfortunately he did not consider that, as the villains claimed to be Englishmen, the scourging must be by a legal process, and that it was not for him to be at once accuser, jury, and judge. He confiscated the whole of the property, sold some of it by auction, and sent the rest for England. Mr. Hannay's remarks on the case are, on the whole, very fair. He says:—

'It is impossible, I am afraid, to acquit the Admiral of great want of judgement, and, what is worse, of inability to resist the temptation to look after his own pocket too eagerly, in the whole course of this transaction. His folly in taking upon himself to decide what was and what was not lawful prize was, of course, glaring. It carried its own punishment. Every man who knew he had a case brought an action against him in the Admiralty Court. One after another they went against him, and he was compelled to refund. What made this the more disastrous for him was that the great convoy, from which he hoped for so much, fell into the hands of La Motte Picquet, who was cruising at the mouth of the Channel, and was almost wholly carried into Brest. The island of St. Eustatius was retaken by Bouillé, and immense booty lost there. Rodney had therefore to satisfy the claims

of the suitors out of the remnants of his prizes and his other means. The drain left him a poor man to the end of his days.'

Meantime he had sent Hood, with the greater part of the fleet, to blockade Fort Royal. It was rumoured that an imposing French armament was on the way out; and Hood proposed that he should look out for it to windward of Martinique, or that Rodney should himself assume the command. It would seem that Rodney doubted the news as to the French fleet; he remained at St. Eustatius administering the affairs of the fatal capture, and sent Hood positive orders to keep up a close blockade of Fort Royal Bay: if the French fleet should come, he could fight it to leeward as well as to windward of the island. The event proved that he was wrong on both points. The French fleet, under Comte de Grasse, arrived in the end of April, succeeded in effecting a junction with the squadron in Fort Royal, and in inflicting a severe check, if not a positive defeat, on the inferior force with Hood. That Hood's chance would have been better had he been able to bring De Grasse to action before the Fort Royal ships could join him is quite clear; but the most fatal mistake was Rodney's absence. He had with him at St. Eustatius a few ships which would have tended to restore the balance, even to leeward of Martinique, and would have given him a slight superiority to windward of it. De Grasse, though an able man, was far from being of the calibre of De Guichen; and we may fairly suppose that what did happen when Rodney met him in April 1782 might equally have happened in April 1781. How different might history then have been! There would, at any rate, have been no battle off Cape Henry, four months later; there would have been no surrender of Cornwallis. Beyond that the speculation cannot go; but it is clear that the fate of the war was largely ruled by this, the most serious professional blunder which Rodney committed. Mr. Hannay's comments on it are severe, but cannot be said to be unjust.

'Whether he [Rodney] or Hood was right as to the best way of meeting Grasse, there can, I should imagine, be only one opinion on the question whether his conduct during these months was worthy of his renown or of his action before and afterwards. At a time when a great hostile force was approaching the station committed to his care, the proper place for an English admiral was at sea and at the head of his fleet. He should not have remained on shore, with the auctioneer's hammer in his hand, superintending the sale of his booty amid surroundings redolent of the redoubted Sir Henry Morgan. His health

was, indeed, bad, but it did not prevent him from putting to sea when informed of the arrival of Grasse. . . . On the whole one has to come back to the view that Rodney's eyes had been dazzled and his better nature corrupted for the time by the fairy gold poured out before him at St. Eustatius.'

It may, however, be urged that Rodney's intelligence from Europe was very uncertain, and that—as is shown by many minor indications, especially in his correspondence with Hood—he placed no faith in the rumours, for they were little more, which reached him of De Grasse's approach. In that case, there seemed no pressing need for his presence at Martinique; while, independent of the pitiful business which Mr. Hannay rightly condemns, the stay at St. Eustatius was more agreeable to his failing health. That this was bad there can be no doubt, and it compelled him shortly afterwards to return to England. He was absent from the station only six months; but he came back to it in February 1782, the last hope of the country. The independence of the colonies had been virtually achieved by the defeat of Graves and the surrender of York Town: all that was now possible was to curb the pride of France and reduce the English losses to a minimum. On the other hand, the allies, growing more energetic by the promise of success, were pushing their advantage at Minorca and Gibraltar, in Europe, or in the West Indies at St. Kitts, captured under the very eyes of Hood, and were now meditating an attack in force on Jamaica. Some fourteen Spanish ships of the line and eight thousand soldiers were assembled at Cape François, where they were to be joined by De Grasse from Martinique with thirty-five sail of the line, five thousand troops, and a large convoy of store ships. Timely reinforcements had brought Rodney's force up to thirty-six sail of the line; and, calmly expectant, he took his position in Gros Islet Bay, waiting the course of events.

On the morning of April 8 the frigate 'Andromache,' commanded by Captain Byron, a son of the admiral and uncle of the poet, came in with the news that the French fleet was putting to sea. In two hours Rodney was in pursuit. He argued that, with the large convoy, De Grasse must take the windward route, outside the islands. He looked for him, therefore, to the north, and the next morning found him under the lee of Dominica, where the trade wind was cut off by the high land, and blew in fitful eddies, alternating with calms and sea breezes. Amid these the English van under Hood separated from the body of the

fleet, which lay helplessly becalmed. De Grasse had the breeze, and with it the option of attacking Hood with his whole force, while Rodney might look on, unable to assist. The danger was imminent; but fortunately De Grasse was not a man of that sort. His head was full of the 'ulterior 'objects,' of the expedition, and he could not realise that the most certain way to achieve them was to begin by smashing first Hood and then Rodney. The rest must have followed as a matter of course. This, however, was quite contrary to the teaching and the guiding rule of the French navy in the eighteenth century; and though De Grasse could not resist the temptation to attack Hood, he did it in a half-hearted way with a small portion of his fleet. The result was thus a trifling skirmish, in which a few ships on each side were more or less disabled, and the French fleet was delayed so as to render its escape to windward without an action very improbable. De Grasse had missed his chance, and fate prepared to take a dire revenge.

Of the operations of the next two days Mr. Hannay has given a very clear account. It necessarily enters into details; for the forcing an unwilling enemy to action when he happened to be to windward was essentially a matter of details. It is enough here to say that at daylight on April 12 Sir Charles Douglas, the captain of the fleet, wakened the Admiral with the glad news that 'God had 'given him his enemy on the lee bow.' It is unnecessary to enter on a description of the great battle which followed. Grand as the story is, it is comparatively familiar, and may now be passed over lightly. Mr. Hannay has told it, on the whole, very well, and leaves the reader with a clear conception of what took place; of how Rodney enticed the enemy still further to leeward; of how the English, forming their line towards the north-east, struck the French line standing towards the south, and keeping away, passed along it to leeward, engaging it at the closest possible quarters; of how the French line, coming under the lee of the high land, was met by a southerly eddy and broken; of how Rodney in the 'Formidable,' and the ships immediately astern, passed through one gap so formed, while Commodore Affleck in the 'Bedford' led the leading ships of the rear division through another similar gap; of how the French ships, thus taken at a disadvantage, not having cleared their guns on the larboard side, suffered fearfully; of how they ran to leeward in the vain hope of reforming their line, but were prevented doing so by the close pursuit of the English, who before nightfall

captured five of their ships, including the 'Ville de Paris,' with the flag of the commander-in-chief.

Mr. Hannay mentions but does not elaborate the discussion about 'breaking the line,' and in the absence of new evidence he has acted wisely; in any case, the manœuvre became Rodney's when he adopted it. Taken as a whole, the account of the battle is very good; but to this we are forced to make one exception, which, from the personal point of view, is serious. He says: 'That every man may have his fair share of honour, the list of the two fleets is here given in the order in which they went into battle.' It is scarcely credible, but it is a fact that in the list so introduced, besides many minor inaccuracies, two of the English captains' names are misspelt, one of them, Bowen, appearing as Brown; and nine out of the thirty-six, that is exactly one-fourth, are assigned to wrong ships. Nor is it the list alone that is wrong. He has emphasised it in an imaginative paragraph, meant to be a graphic description of the 'breaking the line.' He points out, rightly enough, that as the signal to engage to leeward was not altered, the 'Formidable' might have found herself isolated to windward of the French line had the captains who followed her stuck to the letter of the order; and continues:—

'Happily a very different spirit prevailed now, and Captain Inglis of the "Namur," the next ship astern to the "Formidable," looking to the spirit and not to the letter, followed his admiral through the gap, though the signal to engage to leeward had not been hauled down. He was himself followed by Cornwallis in the "St. Albans," Dumaresq in the "Canada," Charrington in the "Repulse," and Fanshawe in the "Ajax." These vessels filed past the "Glorieux," reducing her to a wreck. Captain Inglis, looking after her as she dropped astern of him, saw her almost blown out of the water by the fire of the "St. Albans."'

Now, not one of the men so singled out commanded the ships so named. Fanshawe, Inglis, and the others did indeed distinguish themselves, and very much in the manner described, but not in these ships. Fanshawe, for instance, commanded the 'Namur;' Inglis, the 'Saint Albans;' and their descendants, who are with us to this day, rightly hold the names of 'Namur' and 'Saint Albans' in cherished remembrance. To them, and many others, such a sentence as that we have quoted cannot but be irritating in an extreme degree.

That more might and should have been made of the victory must now be admitted: that the beaten and flying

enemy ought to have been vigorously and relentlessly pursued is very certain. Douglas urged it vehemently the same night, and Hood, the next day, gave it as his opinion that twenty ships might have been taken. Rodney, on the other hand, decided that, with many of his ships crippled, the pursuit would have been dangerous, and that, in the darkness of the night, the enemy might have got to windward, and had the British Islands at their mercy. Captain Mahan considers these reasons 'creditable to his imagination,' for the French were thoroughly beaten, and could not have had any idea of aggression; and Mr. Hannay says:—

'These are, frankly, not reasons which would have satisfied Hawke, or Rodney himself twenty years before. But he was old, broken by disease, his hour of full triumph had come late, he had that day had thirteen hours of incessant strain of work and anxiety. . . . The failure to pursue was a blot; but, after all, as Sir Charles Douglas was wont to say, "a great deal *had* been done." If we had not twenty prizes instead of five, we had destroyed at a blow the laboriously built up prestige of the French fleets in the New World, which was something. We had restored our own nerve and shaken the enemy's.'

They did, indeed, keep a considerable fleet in the West Indies or North America, but without any real intention of attempting any aggressive operations. And the peace, when it was concluded, was not altogether unfavourable:—

'We were, indeed, compelled to acknowledge the independence of the United States, and we restored Minorca and Florida to Spain; but we kept Gibraltar, we fixed our grip for ever on India, and we settled on equal terms with France. Our position was in reality intact, and our spirit unbroken. That this was so was largely due to the victory of April 12. It is therefore right that this day and the man who commanded on it should be remembered among the great days and the great men of the Empire.'

With the change of Government, Rodney was superseded. The new ministers were in no humour to show favour or tolerance to any nominee of Lord Sandwich, and it may well be that Keppel felt a personal antipathy to one whose praises had, two years before, been so offensively hurled at his head. Unfortunately for them, Admiral Pigot, who was appointed to succeed him, had just sailed when the news of the battle and the victory arrived. They endeavoured to stop Pigot, and, failing in that, made all the amends in their power. A peerage was conferred on Rodney, with a pension of 2,000*l.* a year, and the committee of inquiry into the St. Eustatius prize affairs, which had been instituted in a hostile spirit, was discharged. And when he arrived in

England he was received with 'unmeasured popular applause.'

'From the day of his landing at Bristol till he retired from Court surfeited with praise he was surrounded by cheering crowds, and when the applause died away it left a solid admiration and gratitude which endured to the end. He survived his triumphant return nearly ten years, but it is to be feared that there was more glory than ease in the end of his life. The lawsuits which sprang out of those unlucky transactions at St. Eustatius followed him almost to the grave—they, or their consequences, which were pecuniary embarrassments. His gout too grew upon him, and before the close had begun, according to a not improbable report, to affect his understanding.'

He died just one hundred years ago, on May 23, 1792.

In assigning Rodney his place among English admirals, Mr. Hannay ranks him as next to Blake and Nelson. We too would place Rodney very high, but not quite so high as this; and, indeed, Mr. Hannay has, in other pages, implied the superiority of Hawke. Rodney may, perhaps, be rightly placed next after Blake and Nelson. Hawke we would place between them, as a man whose professional career was without a flaw, and whose great victory at Quiberon Bay did not merely shake the enemy's nerve, but absolutely crush his naval power. For the rest, Mr. Hannay's summary is true and felicitous.

'Personally Rodney was a very complete example of that aristocracy which governed England through the eighteenth century—with much selfishness and much corruption, no doubt, yet in the main with a high spirit, with foresight, with statesmanship, and with glory. . . . They would intrigue for place, and would, in matters of detail, allow the interest of "the connexion" to go before the good of the State; but when they spoke for their country to the foreigner, then they thought only of the greatness of England. For that greatness Rodney fought and would willingly have died. For it, and at a time of due need, he, at the head of a force he helped to perfect, did a very great thing. For that, his name should never be forgotten by Englishmen.'

ART. VIII.—*The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon. The Story as told by the Imperial Ambassador resident at the Court of Henry VIII. In usum laicorum.* By J. A. FROUDE. Being a supplementary volume to the Author's 'History of England.' 8vo. London: 1891.

SIX years have elapsed since we reviewed M. Friedmann's work entitled 'Anne Boleyn: a Chapter of English History from 1527 to 1536.' In that article, and in two previous notices of one of the volumes of the Spanish Calendar, edited by Don Pascual de Gayangos, and of two of the volumes of the State Papers preserved in English libraries, by Mr. Gairdner, published respectively in 1880 and 1884, we gave a full account of the relations of the King to his first two wives, without thinking it worth our while to enter minutely into the evidence as regards points which had been disputed, but which are established by conclusive evidence. It did not occur to us to allude in any way to the first four volumes of Mr. Froude's History of the reign of Henry VIII. from the death of Wolsey. We considered that his view of the character of the King had been so entirely extinguished by the two articles which had dealt with the subject—one of which appeared in this Journal in July 1858, the other in the 'Christian Remembrancer' of July 1859—that there was no need of any further allusion to the subject. Neither have we heard that since that time, though several editions of that and subsequent parts of the History have been published, the author has made many converts to his paradoxical opinion that Henry was sacrificing himself for the good of the nation, and ought to be spoken of as being unfortunate in his relations with the women he married.

Since that time a flood of light has been thrown both upon home transactions and upon the relations of the King with foreign courts, by the publication of several series of State Papers. The late Mr. Brewer led the way with the first volume of a series, which has been continued by his able successor, Mr. Gairdner, down to a later period of the reign than we are now concerned with. Then came the Venetian papers of Mr. Rawdon Browne, which began in 1864, and the astonishing revelations of the Simancas Records, the first instalment of which appeared two years later. Now all the documentary evidence contained in these three series of volumes points in the same direction. It

only serves to blacken the character of the King, and even to render it extremely doubtful whether he was not guilty of other and, if possible, greater crimes than history has hitherto laid to his charge. So plain is this that we hoped that Mr. Froude would have abandoned his position altogether, or, at least, modified the views with which six and thirty years ago he startled the English public. Instead of this he professes to find in all the contemporary letters and papers which he has himself examined, or whose epitomes he has been content to take from the hands of other explorers of English and foreign manuscripts, full confirmation of the views which he had adopted apparently before he had himself had access even to the English Record Office. We will not commit ourselves to the use of censorious language, but we must say that the obliquity of judgement which he displays astonishes us; for we aver that, if Mr. Froude *bona fide* believes in the theory to which he is committed—in which belief he stands absolutely alone—his is a class of mind which we possess no means of fathoming or in any way understanding. We therefore regret that he has thought it desirable or necessary to revert to a subject on which his warmest admirers are at variance with him.

We shall proceed to point out some of the mistakes into which Mr. Froude has fallen and in which he now persists, appearing to think that the newly published documents already alluded to are all in favour of his hypothesis. In order to influence his readers in favour of this theory he has prepared the way by an introduction which occupies twenty pages, written in his usual brilliant style, in which he appeals to the anti-Roman and other insular prejudices of his countrymen, in behalf of the blessed Reformation on the ground of its having been the cause and origin of all England's greatness as well as that of all Protestant nations. It contains a sustained invective against Roman Catholic and Anglican authorities for their inability to throw off the prejudices in which they have been educated, whilst he makes use of the cold impartiality of Macaulay to upset the views of Protestant writers by alleging that he has pointed out unanswerably that in all his most questionable acts Craumer and other prelates and ministers were Henry's accomplices. And thus, because readers will be unwilling to admit that the composer and translator of the prayers in the English liturgy could be the miserable wretch described by Macaulay and Lingard, he seems to have instituted a defence for the atrocious crimes of the King. The characters of Cranmer

and other reformers have been somewhat roughly handled and exposed of late, and whatever opinion people may have formed of the merits of the Reformation, no one who knows anything of the history of the period would now think of defending the conduct of many of the principal persons engaged in the process; and everyone is able now to acquiesce in the view that the changes brought about in the sixteenth century and their results may be contemplated apart from any consideration of the supposed virtues or vices of those who were most intimately concerned in effecting them. It is argued by the Catholic party that the rupture with Rome was so tainted and polluted by the crimes and cruelty of those by whom it was brought about, that the Reformation itself is an accursed thing. It is argued by Mr. Froude that the Reformation was so beneficent a revolution, that it justifies the means by which it was accomplished. Neither argument is sound. The crimes of Henry VIII. do not affect the moral grandeur of the Reformation; and the blessings of the Reformation do not palliate the crimes of Henry VIII. The author's appeal, therefore, to the prejudices of the English people has come too late, and however eloquent and persuasive may be the language in which he has paved the way for the acceptance of his theory, it will be of no avail. In the face of recent publications of State Papers, and in spite of all the impassioned appeals to judge of the right or wrong of events by measuring them by their consequences, people will still recognise in Henry VIII. the King who never spared man in his cruelty nor woman in his lust, and whose conduct has scarcely been paralleled in the world's history, even in the accounts transmitted to us from ancient times of Eastern or Roman tyranny and brutality.

Before entering on the task, we must add that Mr. Froude has, we think, somewhat incautiously shown his hand in his introductory chapter, where he alleges that he does not pretend to impartiality, that he believes the Reformation to have been the greatest incident in English history, and that he is, therefore, unwilling to believe more evil than he can help of his countrymen who accomplished so beneficent a work. Accordingly, he objects to stories and rumours, even though contemporaneous, which are to the discredit of the actors in the drama, though being quite willing to accept similar accounts if they are to their credit; and he entirely, as we shall see in the sequel, ignores the inexorable logic of facts detailed in contemporary writers or historians, whilst to prop up his defence of his hero he avows that it is

impossible to separate the King from his counsellors, and that if we condemn Henry we are bound to extend our condemnation not only to Cranmer, but also to the reforming leaders who jointly with the King were the authors of this tremendous and beneficent revolution. This allegation is partially true, though it is an exaggeration to imply that all prelates, judges, and juries were alike the King's accomplices, and it is an unjust charge upon the nation at large to say that they were on the King's side in all the fearful acts of lust and cruelty of which he was guilty. On the contrary, it is abundantly plain from the imperial ambassador's letters, as well as from other sources, that the people would have risen *en masse* against him if only they could have ranged themselves under a competent leader, and that the Emperor might have been successful if he had seen fit to invade England at that time. But we may observe that, though Mr. Froude is so tender of the general reputation of his countrymen of the sixteenth century, he is by no means unwilling to put the worst possible interpretation on the words and acts of the Pope and the cardinals, whilst as regards Englishmen he seems to take an especial delight in decrying an important section of them—the clergy, both seculars and regulars. In fact, he seems to believe that whilst the English people at large were a nation deserving of all credit for loyalty, love of freedom, and general uprightness of conduct, the clergy were monsters of iniquity, whose fraudulent conduct it was absolutely necessary to restrain by a process which in several places he describes in the significant language of having their claws clipped.

Before, however, following Mr. Froude into minute details which we shall find it necessary to discuss, we ought, perhaps, to present our readers with a general description of the tone and character of the work, and, fortunately, the author has, at p. 293, supplied us with what will, perhaps, be thought a sufficient account of his views of political morality. If we had printed the whole passage as representing our own opinion, which we could not have done because it contains fallacies against which we should be obliged to enter an indignant protest, we might be accused of presenting a caricature of sentiments which we wished to expose. As it is, we shall let Mr. Froude speak for himself. He says:—

‘To try the actions of statesmen in a time of high national peril by the canons of an age of tranquillity, is the highest form of historical

injustice. The naked truth—and nakedness is not always indecent—was something of this kind. A marriage with a brother's wife was forbidden by the universal law of Christendom. Kings, dukes, and other great men, who disposed as they pleased of the hands of their sons and daughters, found it often desirable, for political or domestic reasons, to form connexions which the law prohibited, and therefore they maintained an Italian conjuror who professed to be able for a consideration to turn wrong into right. To marriages so arranged it was absurd to attach the same obligations as belonged to unions legitimately contracted. If, as often happened, such marriages turned out ill, the same conjuror who could make, could unmake. This function also he was repeatedly called on to exercise, and for a consideration also he was usually compliant. The King of England had been married as a boy to Catherine of Aragon, carrying out an arrangement between their respective fathers. The marriage had failed in the most important object for which royal marriages are formed—there was no male heir to the crown nor any prospect of one. Henry therefore, as any other prince in Europe would have done, applied to the Italian for assistance. The conjuror was willing, confessing that the case was one where his abilities might properly be employed. But another of his supporters interfered and forced him to refuse. The King of England had always paid his share for the conjuror's maintenance. He was violently deprived of a concession which it was admitted he had a right to claim. But for the conjuror's pretensions to make the unlawful lawful, he would not have been in the situation in which he found himself. What could be more natural than that, finding himself thus treated, he should begin to doubt whether the conjuror after all had the power of making wrong into right?—whether the marriage had not been wrong from the beginning? And when the magical artist began to curse, as his habit was when doubts were thrown on his being the Vicar of the Almighty, what could be more natural also than to throw him and his tackle out of window?'

We forbear to comment upon this passage. We must leave to the reader to form his own judgement on the mistakes of fact and of principle, and the opprobrious tone of the writer. It would not, however, be right altogether to omit noticing that Mr. Froude appears to be entirely unconscious of the methods used and the extent of power possessed by his Italian conjuror. He seems to us not to have studied the canon law, or to be aware that in the eyes of Catholics, the *Curia Romana* was and is a supreme court of appeal, especially competent to decide exceptional cases, invested with power to bind and to loose, and that its procedure is governed by the strict rules of ecclesiastical law. Hence he has confused the two ideas, which are quite distinct, of pronouncing that a marriage was null and void from the first, from whatever cause, and that of dissolving a marriage

duly solemnised and consummated. The first of these cases has often occurred in history, though it must be admitted that the decision has frequently been given on scandalously insufficient evidence, and from corrupt motives. The latter power has never been claimed by any Pope. The whole question between the King and Queen was not whether the Pope had power to divorce them on the supposition of their marriage being valid, but whether the connexion was unlawful because of the invalidity of the dispensation under which it was contracted. That was a pure point of ecclesiastical law, and had the Pope been a free agent he would probably have followed the precedent of the divorce granted to Louis XII. of France some thirty years before. But the Pope was not a free agent. Mr. Froude has abundantly shown that Clement VII. was a mere tool of Charles V. Just before, Rome had been sacked by the Duke of Bourbon—the Pope was a prisoner in St. Angelo and driven out to Orvieto—the Imperial forces occupied Italy: and throughout the negotiations which ensued with Henry VIII. it is evident that his chief antagonist was not the Pope but the German Kaiser, who defended the interest of his aunt, the Queen of England.

We proceed to the first and most important point in which we are at issue with Mr. Froude, premising only that there are two subjects which he passes over in silence. Both of these have a very important bearing on the case for the divorce, and both points, whatever may have been the amount of evidence concerning them before the publication of Mr. Froude's original work, have been since that time established beyond all possibility of question. We mean the virginity of the Queen at the time of her second marriage, and the genuineness of the breve which was produced after the arrival of Campeggio in this country. If the assertion of the Queen as to the former point, as detailed in Campeggio's diary, is thought insufficient to establish the case, the treatise of Cranmer, which will be further alluded to presently, is conclusive. As to the production of the breve, which was so opportune to the case that it led to a suspicion of its forgery, its genuineness has been satisfactorily proved, and Dr. Lingard's opinion amply verified by considerations which we have no space to enter upon here. We shall only say that it has been seen by M. Friedmann, and by other experts, who assert that it has no appearance of having been a forgery. The Emperor had refused all the solicitations

made by Henry for its transmission to England, probably rightly guessing that when once in this country it would be promptly destroyed, so as no longer to be producible in evidence at the trial. Mr. Froude does not venture to imply his present disbelief in the genuineness of the breve, but is content to avow his opinion that at that time there was little doubt that the breve had been forged for the occasion. This is not true; but only that the King and his advisers pretended that they believed it to be a forgery.

The first point, then, on which we shall join issue with Mr. Froude is as to the nature of the connexion with Mary Boleyn, the elder sister of the lady for whom the King divorced his legitimate wife, Catherine of Aragon. In the editor's preface to the '*Records of the Reformation*,' published at Oxford in 1870, it is said that this intrigue can no longer be denied with any show of reason, yet Mr. Froude produces an elaborate defence of his opinion that no such scandalous connexion ever took place. The case for the establishment of the accusation is succinctly stated in that preface as follows: 'The King on one occasion, when 'charged with having meddled with the mother and the 'daughter'—that is to say, with Lady Elizabeth Boleyn and Mary—'denied that there had been any such intercourse 'with the mother, thereby tacitly admitting the other 'charge, which, however, is sufficiently proved by the terms 'of the bull drawn up by Foxe for the Pope to sign, allowing 'the King to marry even the sister of one who had been 'illegitimately connected with him. But to complete the 'evidence, the reader is referred to the elaborate argument 'which Cranmer drew up with the view of covering all the 'doubtful points in the case for the divorce,' and further reference is made in the same place to a document printed in the body of the work, which is assigned by the editor to March 1533, but more probably by Mr. Gairdner to May 1533, in which a certain priest is accused before the sheriff of York for having 'said maliciously that the King's grace 'should first keep the mother, and after the daughter, and 'now he hath married her whom he kept afore, and her 'mother also.'* As nothing more was ever heard of this affair, we may probably suppose that it was thought best to drop all further proceedings; but, however that may be, it is evident that some such rumour had reached as far as Yorkshire two years before what was formerly supposed to

* *Records*, No. 329, vol. ii. p. 468.

be the first mention of it in the printed copy of Pole's work which appeared in 1535. It had, however, been talked of in London four years before that, for Chapuys informed the Emperor, December 9, 1529, that the attempt to procure a divorce was no matter of conscience, as 'there 'would have been still greater affinity to contend in this 'intended marriage than in that of the Queen, his wife.' Mr. Froude makes a great point of Pole's supposed ignorance of this scandal, because no mention of it occurs in the first draft of that book, which is in manuscript. There may have been other reasons besides Pole's ignorance which induced him to abstain from any allusion to this intercourse. But if Cardinal Pole had not heard of it, it is plain that other people had. We are quite content, however, to allow him all the benefit to be derived from a disbelief of rumours and gossip, which we know generally exaggerates matters as it has in this case, though it may be observed there is generally some foundation for every rumour. Such stories, if not otherwise authenticated, must be judged by antecedent probabilities, by the characters of the accused parties, and by whatever amount of circumstantial evidence is producible, and in the want of absolute or convincing proof it is the duty of every one to endeavour to believe in the innocence of the accused. However, as Mr. Froude appears to believe that the whole evidence amounts to nothing, we proceed to examine his argument, premising that he has entirely omitted to take any cognisance of one principal item of that evidence. And here it will be in point to observe that Mr. Froude has advanced far beyond what he ventured to allege in his 'History of England.' There he says that the story is not proved, and that in his opinion the balance of probability is the other way. Now he is of opinion that the story cannot possibly be true, though there is not a particle of additional evidence brought forward on his side, whilst many utterances, more or less distinct, are producible which show how commonly believed the story was.

The dispensation which had been drawn up at home for the Pope to sign was worded in such a manner as to allow the King to marry any woman who was connected with him even in the first degree of affinity, and *even if that affinity had been created by unlawful intercourse*. It might indeed have been thought—and indeed it was thought—when this pretended bull first came to be printed, that it was a forgery of a later date. Herbert, whose History was first published

in 1672, prints a copy of this dispensation, which he found in a book of records, and expressly says that it was written by a later hand and on loose paper. He thought it a suspicious document, to which he would not have given publicity had he not seen it already printed in a book called '*Anti-Sanderus*,'* but adds that he had met in our archives with some despatches that make it probable. There are other copies of the document in the Harleian and in the Cottonian collections in the British Museum. It has been said that no such dispensation had been either asked or granted, and that this pretended dispensation was afterwards forged by Queen Elizabeth's enemies to defame her, it being further alleged that the bull of dispensation which the King asked for was printed by Dr. Burnet among his Records, and that there is no such clause in it. So great, indeed, is the effrontery of the request made by Henry and his advisers that it certainly did form a very strong argument for its being a later forgery, and if Mr. Froude's argument had been directed to prove that the bull was not authentic and there had been no other evidence on the subject, it would perhaps have carried conviction to the minds even of those who, like Herbert, had seen other despatches which lent it some degree of probability. Moreover it is certain that no dispensation in any degree resembling it has ever issued from Rome, and a further suspicion attaches to the document, inasmuch as it distinguishes between the cases of licit and illicit intercourse which it might be thought no accomplished canonist would have attempted to distinguish, it being so well-known a principle of Canon Law that '*secundum canones etiam per coitum fornicarium et incestuosum contrahitur affinitas.*' But Mr. Froude makes no attempt to prove that the document is a forgery, and that for a very good reason, for there exists in the Record Office an original draft in a contemporary hand of no less a person than Gambara, with a parallel column of criticism upon it, which was printed at length in the Oxford Records of the Reformation, and has

* '*Anti-Sanderus*' was a small quarto volume published at Cambridge anonymously in the year 1593. It is an answer to the charges brought against the King and Queen Elizabeth by Sanders in the form of two dialogues held at Venice, and defends the character of the Queen from the charge of unchastity, amongst other reasons by alleging her severity against several ladies of her court who had been seduced, some by the promise of marriage, others by offers of money, &c. The authorship has been attributed to Dr. Cowell, but it is now supposed to have been composed by Dr. Court.

since been analysed by Mr. Brewer, who describes it as follows :—

‘Proposed bull of dispensation for Henry VIII., in case his marriage with Katharine, his brother’s widow, be pronounced unlawful, to marry another even if she have contracted marriage with another man, provided it be not consummated, and even if she be of the second degree of consanguinity, or of the first degree of affinity *ex quocunque licito seu illicito coitu*, in order to prevent uncertainty in the succession, which in past times has been the occasion of war, with comments in the margin in the same hand as the text complaining of the preamble and desiring it should be expunged as reflecting unworthily on the King. The writer contends that the dispensation should be unconditional without reference to the dissolution of the present marriage.’ Another contemporary copy is in Knight’s hand, and is dated from Orvieto, 10kl. Jan. 1527—i.e. December 23, 1527. A different draft, with considerable variations, but containing the particular clause relating to the first degree of affinity, has been printed by Mr. Brewer with the date (December 6) assigned to it, but the document itself is undated. On this Mr. Brewer, in the brilliant Introduction which forms the Preface to the three parts of his fourth volume, observes as follows :—

‘This extraordinary document could have in view no other contract than the King’s marriage with Anne Boleyn. It must have been intended to remove certain impediments to her union with the King, and anticipate objections which might hereafter arise as to the validity of their union. The numerous corrections and additions made in the draft show with what care and consideration it was drawn up, and how fully it was intended by its framers to overrule all canonical flaws and defects. The commission was intended to dissolve the King’s marriage with Katharine; the dispensation, to remove all obstacles to his marriage with Anne Boleyn. What those obstacles were, real or supposed, I need not detail. They are startling enough; nor can it be supposed that provisions so minute and circumstantial would have found a place in this document had not certain objections against the King’s union in this instance existed in fact or common report.’ (P. cccxxix.)

The irony of Mr. Brewer’s remarks on the *obstacles real or supposed*, and the objections existing, whether *in fact or common report*, would have been perfect if he had not added in a note the well-known story of Sir George Throgmorton’s conversation with the King, when the King denied that he had ever had any criminal intercourse with the mother, i.e. Lady Elizabeth Boleyn, upon which Cromwell had observed,

‘Nor with the sister nother, and therefore put that out of ‘your mind.’ This story Mr. Froude dismisses as altogether apocryphal. He says, ‘Mr. Brewer accepts the version of a ‘confessed boaster as if it was a complete and trustworthy ‘account of what had actually passed.’ Well, we accept it also, but are quite content to waive it as being altogether unnecessary, the evidence of the *liaison* being sufficiently complete without it.

We have been thus particular in establishing the authenticity of this proposed bull, which was drawn up in England for the Pope to sign, because Mr. Froude’s principal argument against the supposed intrigue would lead an unwary reader to imagine that he was arguing against the authenticity of the document. If that were in dispute, which by the admission of all parties it is not, the following argument would have considerable weight.

‘To what else, it is asked, can such extraordinary expressions refer, unless to some disgraceful personal *liaison*? The uninstructed who draw inferences of fact from the verbiage of legal documents will discover often what are called mare’s nests. I will request the reader to consider what this supposition involves. The dispensation would have to be copied into the Roman registers subject to the inspection of the acutest canon lawyers in the world. If the meaning is so clear to us, it must have been clear to them. We are therefore to believe that Henry, when demanding to be separated from Catherine as an escape from mortal sin, for the relief of his conscience, and the surety of his succession, was gratuitously putting the Pope in possession of a secret which had only to be published to extinguish him and his plea in an outburst of scorn and laughter.’ (P. 56.)

Now, letting alone the *petitio principii* involved in this paragraph as to the King’s conscience, about which Mr. Froude and all other historians of any note are irreconcilably at variance, we ask what is this argument directed against. If it is meant for his readers to infer that no such document ever existed till long after the time when it professes to have been written, it is certainly a fair conclusion that such effrontery on the part of the King and his advisers is inconceivable, and therefore it must be a mere forgery. But as no one pretends that,—one copy of it having been written and corrected by Uberto de Gambarà, the Prototary and Papal Nuncio at the English Court, we must fall back upon the supposition that the provisions it contains are, as Mr. Froude wishes us to believe, merely the verbiage of a legal document, to mislead the uninstructed. Well, the eminent men who have recently written on the subject

are certainly not uninstructed. Still, we do not care to appeal to the expressed opinions of other historians, however learned or eminent. We simply challenge the production of any other document—and there are hundreds of such at the Vatican—which in the least degree resembles the particularities of this dispensation. A very few cases had occurred for a dispensation for a marriage between persons who were related in the first degree of affinity. One exactly parallel case is that of Emanuel King of Portugal, for whom two such dispensations had been obtained, but it will not be pretended that these, any more than a hundred other dispensations, contained amidst all their verbiage any such clause as the one in question.

Again, Mr. Froude says (p. 57) Wolsey was not a fool. Is it conceivable that he would have composed a document so fatal and have drawn the Pope's pointed attention to it? What, again, is this argument worth, except to prove that the document is not authentic? We answer, neither was Foxe a fool, yet he drew up the document. Neither was Gambara, the Papal Nuncio, a fool, yet he copied the document and suggested certain alterations in it.

There remains another document which alone would be sufficient to establish the fact that Mary Boleyn had been the King's mistress. This was first published in its entirety in 1870 in the '*Records of the Reformation*,' and consists of an elaborate argument written by Cranmer with the view of covering all the doubtful points in the case for the divorce.

The heads of the different sections had been printed by Burnet amongst his *Records*, but probably he had never given himself the trouble to read the whole document, or if he had read it and understood its meaning, he would probably have suppressed it. It is a document that must cover the name of Cranmer with lasting infamy; for it professes to remove the objection which might be alleged to the virginity of Catherine at the time of her second marriage, if that should come into question, and also the other objection to the marriage with Anne on the score of her being within the prohibited degrees of affinity; and here the future archbishop takes the bull by the horns at once and boldly declares his belief that affinity which is created by illicit intercourse is an affinity created by pontifical law only and has no effect. The copy of this paper had been sent by the editor of the '*Records of the Reformation*' to the late Dr. Hook to assist him in preparing his *Life of Archbishop Cranmer*, and after it had been read by Lord Hatherley and

Dr. Swainson, they all agreed that it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that Cranmer was aware of the connexion that had existed between Mary Boleyn and the King. With regard to this point and the other most important fact connected with the history of the divorce, the editor of these volumes observes that 'the elaborate discussion of the case 'in this paper admits of no other explanation than on the 'hypothesis of both these points being well known to the 'writer of the *tréatise*.' This paper Mr. Froude has either never seen or has unaccountably forgotten. Those of our readers who are anxious to judge for themselves of the matter must be referred to the original, which is a Latin document extending to sixty-six pages, of which, as the editor says, the disgusting details are fortunately veiled in the decent obscurity of a dead language.

The case is proved to a certainty which is only short of mathematical demonstration, and we have dwelt the longer upon it because though without it the plea of Henry's having been actuated by conscientious motives is destroyed by almost every public act of his life, after the first surrender of himself to the passion for Anne Boleyn, it is by far the easiest and most conclusive argument against him, for he is asking the Pope for a dispensation for a marriage as repugnant to the canon law as that which he wants to have dissolved. We have no space to go further into the matter, but any one who desires to know what more may be said on the subject will find it calmly and conclusively argued in Note B of the appendix to M. Friedmann's second volume of '*Anne Boleyn, a Chapter of English History*,' where he entirely overthrows Mr. Froude's argument from the silence of official documents, alleged in his previous work and adhered to in his recent publication.

The establishing his case in this particular is, as we have said, of the last importance to Mr. Froude, and that not only for its own sake, but because it would carry with it the exculpation of the King from another charge of equal, or if possible of greater enormity. If there had been no such connexion as that we have been speaking of, the received interpretation of Anne Boleyn's confession to Cranmer before she died could not be the true one. What this confession amounted to was a mystery until Dr. Lingard propounded his conjecture that it was the allegation of the intercourse with her sister which Cranmer in his endeavour to save her life induced her to make. There is no other explanation of this confession at all probable, and M. Friedmann unhesitatingly

adopts it. What passed between the Queen and the Archbishop can never now be known, but after the interview she expected to be pardoned, and said that she would probably be sent out of the country to Antwerp. And thus Cranmer had to eat his own words and declare that the marriage with Anne never had been valid, and to the King attaches the indelible disgrace of having executed for adultery a woman who never having been his wife could not have been guilty of the crime. It was an unprovoked act of the most savage cruelty. The plea of conscience on the part of the King for the divorce of Catherine or the marriage with Anne is entirely destroyed.

It is of some importance to Mr. Froude's argument to represent the idea of the divorce from Catherine of Aragon as having originated at an earlier period than can be ascribed to it if it derived its source from the fascination which Anne Boleyn began to exercise over the King. It would have served his purpose well if he had referred to an obscure hint in an Italian letter of September 1, 1514, in which the writer says that the King of England 'means to annul his own marriage, and will obtain what he wants from the Pope, as France did with Pope Julius.' If Mr. Froude had known of this he would perhaps have alleged it in defence of his view, and we quote it here in evidence of his having neglected to consult some sources from which he might have derived additional information. We observe that he has seldom made any reference to the Venetian despatches published by the late Mr. Rawdon Browne, which throw so much light on the history of the period. The rumour mentioned by the Italian is probably good for nothing; its value, perhaps, may be estimated as on a par with the historical knowledge of the writer, who mistakes Julius II. for Alexander VI., who was the Pope who pronounced the divorce of Louis XII. from Jeanne of France. That there really was no such idea at the time on the score of the probable failure of male issue is plain from the fact that the Queen (somewhat over thirty years of age) was at the time pregnant of the child which was prematurely born three months later, when she was quite young enough for the hope of future issue, and is described by Gerard de Pleine in a letter to Margaret of Savoy a few months earlier as follows: 'The Queen is believed to be with child, and is so, as far as the writer can judge. She is of a lively and gracious disposition, quite the opposite of the queen, her sister [Joan of Aragon], in complexion and manner.'

It is not pretended that the King had ceased to cohabit with her for ten years after this period. Nor was Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond, the only illegitimate son he is known to have had, born till nearly five years after. So that there is really no probability of a divorce having been thought of, for no foreign despatches allude to the subject till after the year 1527. The very fact that in 1525 he had been created Duke of Richmond, a title of peculiar significance, as Mr. Froude has observed, since it had been borne by his grandfather, Henry VII., shows that in that year his father had thoughts of his possible succession to the throne, and therefore probably was not yet thinking of any divorce from Catherine. This document then would not have served Mr. Froude's purpose.

But there is another document of the year 1526 which he presses in favour of his argument that the King's simple and pardonable desire was to insure a male successor to his throne, so as to avoid the possible insurrection that might arise in the event of his daughter, the Princess Mary, succeeding to the crown. There exists a letter of September 13, 1526 (not of the 7th, as Mr. Froude represents), in which the Bishop of Bath and Wells informs Wolsey of the arrival at Paris of a confidential agent of Clement VII., who had spoken to the Bishop of the divorce and the difficulties connected with it. He uses the expression *benedictum divorcium*, evidently alluding to a matter which had been of long standing, and which had caused much annoyance. Mr. Froude immediately jumps at the conclusion that here is point-blank evidence that the matter had been brought before the Pope some time in or before the year 1526. And here he can claim the support of the late Mr. Brewer, for *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus*, and here for once Mr. Brewer is wrong. There cannot be the least doubt that the divorce alluded to was that which Queen Margaret of Scotland was suing for from her second husband, Angus, a suit which had been going on since 1521, and the success of which Wolsey had been doing all in his power to prevent, but which was accomplished in 1528.

Here, again, whilst we are on this subject of inaccuracy, we must caution the readers of Mr. Froude's history to refer to the originals from which he quotes. A single instance will suffice to explain our meaning. At an interval of only two pages from the mistake we have been commenting on, we have an account of the Pope's application to Henry for assistance, on reading which the King burst into tears. This,

of course, would be a good argument to allege for the King being tender-hearted and compassionate. We find three references, two of which are not very accurately represented, whilst the third, which alone alludes to the tears, is from a letter written by the King himself in answer to Clement, stating that he could not avoid shedding tears at reading his Holiness's letter. What the assertion is worth will have to be judged according to the reader's own estimate of the character of Henry VIII. Mr. Froude's view of the matter is useful for the history that follows. The dexterity with which Mr. Froude avoids all difficulties, and escapes from awkward positions, is most remarkable. At the beginning of chapter vi. we are told that the great scene in the hall at the Blackfriars, when the cause of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon was pleaded before Wolsey and Campeggio, is too well known to require further description. The scene was undoubtedly dramatic enough to have afforded the historian an opportunity of describing it, but it would have been inconvenient for the theory that Henry was influenced by conscientious scruples in wanting to get rid of the Queen. We too must refrain from telling the story again, and there is no need that we should do so, for it may be read in contemporary histories as related by an eyewitness; and shall, therefore, only quote one passage from a speech previously made by the King, which will effectually dispose of the defence instituted for him as being 'at any rate free from 'hypocrisy.' He says:—

'As touching the Queen, if it be adjudged by the law of God that she is my lawful wife, there was never anything more pleasant nor more acceptable to me in my life, both for the discharge and clearing of my conscience as also from the good qualities and conditions the which I know to be in her. For I assure you all that . . . she is a woman of most gentleness of mind, humility, and buxomness; yea, of all good qualities appertaining to nobility. She is without comparison, as I these twenty years almost have had the true experiment, so that if I were to marry again, if the marriage might be good I would surely choose her above all other women.'

It must be remembered that this speech was made in 1528, and all this, and a great deal more of the same kind, has to be read in parallel columns with the account of the mock trial of April 1527, and the dallying with Anne Boleyn which had been going on for more than a year, and the letters which at the very time the King was writing to her, and which are full of indecencies, of which we shall venture to quote one, and that not the most improper: 'Wishing

'myself (specially an evening) in my sweetheart's arms, 'whose pretty dukkys I trust shortly to cusse.' All this was known at the time when Mr. Froude wrote his *History* thirty-six years ago. What was not known at that time is the letter in which Eustace Chapuys, who succeeded Mendoza in the summer of 1529, informs the Emperor of the hypocrisy and effrontery of the King, who had said to him that, if the newly discovered breve were valid and genuine, all would be right, and he should have maintained his union with the Queen and enjoyed the advantages and blessings of marriage of which he had been deprived, much to his regret, since the beginning of the present dispute.* And this was at a time when the doubtful connexion with Anne Boleyn was being talked of in every court of Europe. It is most extraordinary how Mr. Froude can shut his eyes to all that makes against his favourite hypothesis. He has actually in his notes referred to the letter in which Henry makes this avowal, at the very time when he was trying to get the Emperor to send the breve to England for the purpose of having it destroyed, and so preventing its ever being used in evidence for the Queen. For the wonderful mistakes of printing in several references here we suppose we must exonerate Mr. Froude and lay the blame upon the printer.

Many readers of English history perhaps have never heard the name of Eustace Chapuys, though perhaps some will recognise the imperial ambassador in the *Capucius* of Shakespeare. He arrived in England in 1529, and remained as ambassador from Charles till 1539 without any intermission, and returned after an interval of a few months in 1540. At the time of his arrival in England he was not more than thirty years of age, and yet had been previously employed on various missions as a privy councillor of Charles III., Duke of Savoy. He died in 1556 at Louvain, in Belgium. He makes little figure in histories of the reign till the publication of Dr. Lingard's great work, but since that time his name is well known to editors of State Papers and diligent readers of the recent Calendars of Mr. Gairdner and Don Pascual de Gayangos. He was, of course, a firm adherent to the Queen's cause, and cannot be spoken of as an unprejudiced witness; but he had more opportunities than any other foreign ambassador of becoming acquainted with the temper and institutions of the English people, for no other envoy from any foreign Power was employed so long as he was at the

* Spanish Calendar, Sept. 27, 1529.

English Court. We learn much from the despatches of the French ambassadors which have recently been published by M. Kaulek in the volumes of the '*Inventaire Analytique des Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères*,' as well as from the reports made to the Doge and Senate of Venice by their ambassadors, who seldom remained at their post for more than two years; but Chapuys' despatches are of far greater value, not only because of his superior knowledge of English affairs, but also and chiefly because his letters to the Emperor and the Queen of Hungary are so continuous, so long, and so full of detail. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that Mr. Froude should have much to add to the History which he published some six and thirty years back, for these State Papers have been brought to light since that time, and their contents have scarcely yet been embodied in any history of the period. Of Eustace Chapuys' character we wish we could give a more favourable account; but he does not rise above the level of other diplomatists of the time. He was, no doubt, sincerely devoted to his master's service, but in advancing the Emperor's interests he did not scruple to use means which cannot be justified on any principles of morality. But he was no liar—at least, to his own sovereign,—however he may have thought proper to deceive Cromwell and his master; and his statements of facts which came under his own cognisance are certainly trustworthy, and are, in some instances, most remarkably confirmed by the accounts transmitted by the French ambassador Marillac to Francis and the Constable Anne de Montmorency. History has, in one respect, benefited by his unscrupulousness. He had unluckily left behind him, in a house which was afterwards inhabited by Marillac, a bundle of drafts and papers of his official correspondence, and the French ambassador boasts of their having come into his possession, and makes no scruple of using them for his own purposes. But Chapuys was, in this respect, quite a match for Marillac, for, in a ciphered despatch to the Emperor, dated July 16, 1541, he says that he is in constant correspondence with the French ambassador's man, and that he will spare no trouble in obtaining a copy of the cipher used by him, as well as some original letters addressed to him that may enlighten his Majesty as to the doings of the French; and that no money shall be spared in bribing the man, even if he himself should be ruined by the transaction.

Chapuys succeeded Mendoza as ambassador from the Emperor at the English Court. His credentials bear date

July 7, 1529, and he arrived in England at the end of the following month, and from this time forward for the next ten years we have a flood of light thrown upon English history as detailed in some hundreds of letters, some of them of considerable length, addressed to the Emperor and the aunt and sister of Charles, who were successively governesses of the Low Countries, written at intervals of about a week or a fortnight. We have already alluded to one of these letters, written before he had made much acquaintance with English affairs; and in his earlier correspondence he makes ludicrous mistakes in the spelling of proper names, so as sorely to puzzle Don Pascual de Gayangos, the editor of the Spanish series, who himself is scarcely at home with the names of English families, and has been guilty of much want of accuracy in this as in other particulars.

The principal point in an historical point of view which Mr. Froude has made in this volume is the near risk of a civil war which the King incurred, and the whole blame of which, as a matter of course, the author attributes to the injured Queen, who would not consent to surrender her own rights in favour of an abandoned woman, who was scheming to supplant her on the throne, and had already succeeded in transferring to herself whatever affection or love the King had ever entertained towards her. All this will probably be new to most of his readers, though it has been more or less familiar to scholars who have followed the revelations made by the publication of the successive issues of the Spanish Calendar and Mr. Gairdner's volumes of State Papers. It is probable that at any time during the reign from 1527, as well as in Edward's time, if the Emperor had resolved to assist the insurgents by force of arms he might have prevailed. The first hint we have of this appears in Mendoza's letter to Charles of July 17, 1527, where he tells him that if only six or seven thousand men were landed in Cornwall, forty thousand Englishmen would rise and join them. It must, however, be observed that if the seeds of rebellion and war existed in England, they sprang not exclusively from sympathy for Queen Catherine. The majority of the people of England were Roman Catholics. The whole of the clergy and a large portion of the laity viewed with disgust the rupture of the Church. The Catholic rebellion did, in fact, break out in the 'Pilgrimage of Grace,' after the death of Catherine; but as long as she lived, she was regarded as a champion of the old faith, whilst the innovations of the Reformers were discredited by their con-

nexion with the levity and the vices of Anne Boleyn, who was always detested by the nation. Catherine herself relied on the Catholic party for her protection and defence, and she was not unaware of the disposition of the Catholic leaders to rise in her favour.

Surely it was not to be wondered at that the unprotected Queen should send a servant to the Emperor, her nephew, informing him of the circumstances, nor again that Henry should write to have that messenger intercepted in France on his way to Spain by the King's special order to Wolsey. Her letter to Charles, however, reached him by the same post as Mendoza's, the messenger having probably eluded Wolsey's vigilance, as he expected, by travelling by sea. The Emperor took no notice of Mendoza's suggestion. He was probably of opinion that the intrigue with Anne Boleyn would end much in the same way as that with her elder sister Mary, and that there would be no need for his interference, for he was quite aware that the plea of conscience was only a false issue raised as the only possible way of getting rid of Catherine. He therefore replied that it would be well to use gentle methods of persuasion, and we hear no more of any idea of his armed interference till long after, when Chapuys urged him over and over again at a time when the Emperor knew that an invasion of England would be most inconvenient.

At the time of Mendoza's first suggestion that if the Emperor invaded England he would have a large following of English to assist him in the defence of the Queen, it is scarcely likely that the ambassador had any idea that any such crisis would occur, and it is certain that no such idea had been favoured by Catherine, who long after this time persisted in maintaining that her husband was under some bewitching spell, from which, if he could once be detached from Anne Boleyn and other evil counsellors, she would surely be able to recover him. Her applications to the Emperor always supposed that her nephew would be able to influence the Pope to try the case and decide it in the only way in which she knew he must decide it—in her favour. As late as January 1530 Chapuys was representing to her that Charles's interference was of a friendly kind, and even on April 23 in that year, when the Duke of Norfolk put the question to the imperial ambassador whether he thought his master would make war against England in the interest of the Queen, his aunt, Chapuys had confidently replied that there would be no occasion for such inter-

ference, for her party would be strong enough in England without it. Catherine herself, also, was constantly recommending Chapuys to be conciliatory towards Henry, a piece of advice which he does not seem always to have followed, for, if we may judge from his own account of his interviews, he spoke out most courageously, denouncing the King at one time for not allowing the Queen any foreigners for her counsel, and at another remonstrating with him for the manner in which he had proceeded in bribing and browbeating the authorities of Oxford and Cambridge to decide that the marriage with a brother's widow was invalid. Though Chapuys was not as yet advising the Emperor to resort to violent measures, there is no doubt that the fear of Charles's interfering with an army was constantly present to the King's mind, and that the delay of the trial of the case, and subsequent measures, was mainly owing to the fear of a rebellion on the part of his own subjects. He could pack the House of Commons with his own creatures, and could control many of the temporal peers and most of the bishops, but Catherine was universally beloved, and Anne Boleyn as universally hated and despised. On the other hand, this feeling was pretty well balanced by the strong feeling of the country against papal interference in English affairs; and the summons of the King to Rome for the trial of the case, after the breakdown of the attempted trial before Wolsey and Campeggio, gave him an immense advantage.

Chapuys had hitherto been of opinion that there would be no need for the Emperor's armed interference, but after the marriage with Anne Boleyn had become an accomplished fact, he seems to have been aware that there was no nobleman powerful enough to initiate proceedings, and that for want of a leader there would be no insurrection in favour of the outraged Queen, though there were not wanting peers temporal and spiritual who urged him on to try to induce the Emperor to take up arms in their defence.

Mr. Froude knows as well as anybody that rebellion against a king is not altogether unknown in English history, and surely if ever an insurrection in defence of an injured queen and against a cruel and unprincipled tyrant were justifiable, it would have been so if the nation had taken up arms in behalf of Catherine and of the Church to which a large portion of the nation still belonged; but Mr. Froude is never tired of reiterating his opinion that the King's conduct was justifiable and necessary, because of his feeling of the cer-

tainty of a disputed succession and a civil war if there were no male heir to the crown. Yet the allegation is surely sufficiently disposed of when it is remembered that long after this time the Princess Mary succeeded her brother without any serious disturbance, and that at a time when, owing to the Protestant and Puritan government of Edward's council for six years, the people were far more incensed against the Pope than ever they had been in the reign of his father. Moreover the King seems to have somewhat forgotten his idea that rebellion would ensue in default of a male heir when he forced the Parliament to settle the crown upon Elizabeth (cap. 22, an. 25), or any sister that might be born after her, supposing that he should have no son to succeed him.

Though Mr. Froude has not for the most part attempted to conceal what makes in Catherine's favour, yet it is quite inexcusable to accuse her of indelicacy because of her persistent assertion that the marriage between herself and Prince Arthur had never been consummated. This was so important a point that if it could have been substantiated on the trial it would have at once settled the case; and as her own affirmation would not have been allowed as evidence unless corroborated by other proofs, the Emperor and Empress had sent special messengers all over Spain to find out the truth of the matter from those who had been in attendance on her at the time of her first marriage. Her own affirmation would have been met by a point-blank denial by Henry, who actually had it inserted in the statute already quoted that such consummation had been sufficiently attested before the Archbishop of Canterbury. Whereas it is quite certain that no such allegation had been raised or disputed at the time of the judgement at Dunstable, when Cranmer took very good care that Catherine should have no opportunity of putting in an appearance, and then pronounced her contumacious for not doing so. It was in fact owing to the assertion of the consummation in the breve, with the omission of the word *forsan*, which had been in the previous dispensation of Julius II., that the Queen had refused to be bound by its terms. As to the fact itself, whatever doubts may have been entertained at the time have been entirely set at rest by the revelations made in the Simancas records, though, if the character of the Queen is considered, her assertion of the fact ought to have been sufficient to convince any ordinary inquirer.

From the time of the birth of Elizabeth the imperial

ambassador never ceased to urge on his master the necessity of his landing an armed force to assist the people, who were only waiting for a leader to rise against the King. But it is scarcely probable that Charles ever seriously entertained the project, and his Spanish counsellors were not in favour of it. At last, on March 23, 1534, after more than six years' delay, Clement issued the bull declaring the marriage between Henry and Catherine to be valid, and this with the concurrence of all the cardinals, some of whom had before been wavering, or had taken the opposite side. And at the same time the Act was passing the House of Lords which put an end to the papal jurisdiction in England. From this time forward, accordingly, Chapuys lost no opportunity of urging the Emperor to make war in defence of the Queen's rights. And he even went the length of tempting the King of Scotland to interfere, suggesting that it was quite on the tapis that he might marry the Princess Mary, in which case the Emperor would be glad of the union of the crowns of England and Scotland. It must be said to Chapuys' credit that he spoke out before the King and his council with the utmost courage, and even demanded to be heard in Parliament against the proposed Act of Succession and its penalties, though, of course, he was not called upon to reveal to them the steps he had taken to encourage the disaffected peers and others who were meditating an insurrection. The King was, indeed, in the most imminent danger, and, as Mr. Froude has truly observed, it was chiefly the alarm at the consolidation of the papal power over England that enabled him to hold his subjects together and prevent their rising in rebellion against him.

Mr. Froude makes use of two or three ambiguous expressions in the letters of the Queen to Charles, and in those of Chapuys, which seem to him to imply that she was involved in a conspiracy to induce the Emperor to invade England. She had hoped against hope that the King would submit after the Pope's final sentence was made known; but her appeal seems to be for help for herself and her daughter, both of them threatened with death if they refused to renounce their rightful titles; and she was willing to resign herself to any remedy the Emperor should think right to apply, apparently not in her own mind specifying the means, and evidently being more anxious for the soul of her worthless husband, as well as for the welfare of her daughter, than for her own personal interests. If she thought further about the matter, it is probable she meant that the Emperor's

interference in preventing the trade between Spain and Flanders and this country might be effectual—at least, this is the way in which we understand her words as related by Chapuys—‘lest she should contradict, in the least, what she ‘has said and written on former occasions.’*’

At any rate Chapuys understood the Queen so, for, a few days later than that, Catherine still protested that she would rather suffer a thousand deaths than be the occasion of such misery as would be caused by war. But, though the Queen and the princess were not directly concerned in the movement, a formidable insurrection was very nearly being devised, and only wanted a leader to insure success. It is idle now to speculate what might have been the result if Charles had seen fit to interfere; and, indeed, it is hardly possible to conceive that he ever seriously meditated an invasion of England; but such an invasion was the subject of many hopes and fears at the time. Chapuys’ letters to the Emperor reveal a state of things which English readers till lately have formed little or no conception of.

Surely no ambassador ever spoke out his mind more freely and courageously at a foreign court than Chapuys did when summoned to the meeting of Council on May 15, 1534. It is true that we have only his own account of his conduct at the meeting; but after making every possible allowance for exaggeration, it is scarcely possible to doubt the substantial accuracy of his statements. By the Act recently passed, death had been enacted as the penalty of refusing to take the oath to the succession, and the Council was assembled to determine what was to be done with the two women who refused to consent to their own degradation. Chapuys described to them the whole state of the case, as it appeared to his judgement, in the clearest terms. But the Duke of Norfolk urged that the ladies must submit to the law. The King, of course, could not venture to enforce the threatened penalty on the Queen, and, brutal as he had become, would not have wished to enforce it against his daughter, for whom even he had some lingering affection; but Anne Boleyn was a she-devil, and was quite capable of suggesting the means of getting rid of them both to secure her own position, which was already becoming somewhat unsafe, and would depend upon the sex of the next child, with which she had pretended she was already pregnant. It may perhaps be doubtful whether Chapuys’ information

* Spanish Calendar, vol. v. p. 153.

was strictly correct that the concubine had bribed some one to pretend a revelation from God that she was not to conceive children while the Queen and the Princess were alive, and that she had sent the man with the message to the King, saying that the ladies were rebels and traitresses and deserved to die. It is in the fear of this insurrection on the part of the King that Mr. Froude finds the justification of the tyrannical and inhuman conduct of Henry towards his wife and daughter, and the infamous murders of Sir Thomas More and the saintly Bishop of Rochester. The justification is in the strictest sense of the word preposterous, for it was only the arbitrary will of the King that had made the denial of the Act, and the refusal to subscribe, high treason. But it was of the last importance to justify, if possible, the execution of Fisher, and though no such plea was made in the indictment, Mr. Froude brings him in guilty on the score of his having abetted the hoped-for insurrection, and having been a party to the invitation of the Emperor to invade England. Accordingly we are told (p. 340) that Chapuys' letters leave no doubt of Fisher's disloyalty, and of his desire to bring in an imperial army. We confess we were at first somewhat staggered by this confident assertion, for we had never seen in any of Chapuys' despatches a single expression that warranted any such inference, and Mr. Froude's remark would lead an unwary reader to suppose that, as the communications between the Bishop and the ambassador were frequent, there would be allusions to this subject in their conversations, as reported to the Emperor. We therefore searched the documents again, and are able to say that there is not a single letter which bears out the accusation. But we have found one sentence in a letter from the ambassador to the Emperor, which probably may have misled Mr. Froude. It is of date September 27, 1533, three weeks after the birth of Elizabeth, and runs as follows, as translated by Don Pascual de Gayangos:—

'For, as that excellent and holy man the Bishop of Rochester told me some time ago, the Pope's weapons become very malleable when directed against the obdurate and pertinacious. And therefore it is incumbent upon your Majesty to interfere in this affair, and undertake a work which must be as pleasing in the eyes of God as war upon the Turk.'

The latter paragraph expresses the same opinion which Chapuys is never tired of reiterating in his letters to Charles, and we can only conjecture that Mr. Froude took it to represent the Bishop of Rochester's view, and upon it

has constructed his defence of the condemnation and execution of the newly created cardinal. He has not found the same amount of evidence against Sir Thomas More. So he is content with the allegation that birds of a feather flock together—in other words, that he had been ‘Fisher’s intimate friend and companion, and he could hardly have been ignorant of a conspiracy with which Fisher had been so closely concerned, while malice might be inferred without injustice from an acquaintance with dangerous purposes which he had not revealed. He paid the penalty of the society to which he had attached himself. He even more than the Bishop of Rochester was the chief of the party opposed to the Reformation’ (p. 343). It is thus, we suppose, in Mr. Froude’s eyes the head and front of his offending that he was opposed to the Reformation, and as we are to form our judgements of actions from their ultimate results, the execution of Sir Thomas More ‘was not wanton, and it was not an act of tyranny. It was an inevitable and painful incident of an infinitely blessed Revolution.’

All these horrors are attributed by Mr. Froude to the obstinacy of Catherine, who surely would have been branded with eternal infamy if she had consented to allow that her own marriage was invalid for the sake of allowing her husband to cohabit with a woman of impure life to whom he had taken a fancy, without any declaration from the same source that had authorised her marriage that that authorisation was not valid. The King’s wickedness is hidden under the plea of conscience and the desire for issue male to save the country from the possible chance of a civil war which would never have arisen.

That the lives of the Queen and the Princess Mary were in danger was commonly thought and was certainly believed by themselves, and Mr. Froude apparently holds that this is true, being willing to attribute any amount of villany to Anne Boleyn if only the King can be exculpated. How he would have defended Henry if M. Friedmann’s charge against him for having poisoned the Queen could be substantiated, we do not know. We observe that he has never in any instance referred to this author’s interesting and important work on Anne Boleyn, though we may suppose him to be included in the number of ‘orthodox historians’ whose judgements Mr. Froude has set himself the task of overthrowing. M. Friedmann seems to us to have made out a very good case for the accusation against Henry and Anne, but we must be content to ac-

quiesce in the judgement that the case is not absolutely proved. That Henry in his passionate resentment against Anne should have told the Duke of Richmond that she had attempted to get him and his sister poisoned does not prove much, either as regards her guilt or his own innocence of the death of Catherine. The account given by the Marchioness of Exeter to the imperial ambassador about the words uttered by Henry two months before her death, and the evident joy with which he received the tidings of her death, are more to the point. But as Mr. Froude does not believe the story, he is saved from the necessity of defending the King on this score. Nevertheless, he has done his best to represent the Queen and her daughter as being implicated, as well as Fisher and More, in the conspiracy to dethrone the King by the invitation of foreign forces under the lead of the Emperor. Anyone would think from the constant allusion to this point that Catherine's letters to the Emperor were full of impassioned exhortations to her nephew to land a force in England and proclaim war against her husband. We confidently aver that there is not a single letter in which any such request can be found. On the contrary, as late as November 22, 1533, i.e. more than two months after the birth of Elizabeth, she protests in one of her letters that she would rather die than be the cause of war, and it is scarcely likely that after that time she had changed her mind. Chapuys was, of course, during all the time endeavouring to goad the Emperor on to the enterprise, and was reiterating his complaints of the ill usage of the Queen and her daughter, and perhaps exaggerating the danger in which their lives were placed by the machinations of the concubine, as he persisted in calling Anne; but though several letters of Catherine's to the Pope and to the Emperor have survived and are calendared in the volumes of State Papers of the reign, there is not a word that can fairly be construed in this sense. All that she asks is that the Emperor will apply 'some remedy,' the very same words she had all along used in urging him to influence the late Pope to come to a final decision of the matter. Thus, on April 8, 1535, her entreaty is that his Majesty will *think of some remedy* for her forlorn condition, and, on August 8 of the same year, she entreats the Queen of Hungary to inform her brother, the Emperor, of the dreadful state in which she is, and to use her best efforts with the King of France, and his wife, the Emperor's sister, to be a good friend of the King of England in getting him to abandon the sin in which he is living.

In spite of all the misrepresentations contained in this volume, we are much mistaken if the story, even as told by Mr. Froude, does not enlist all the reader's prejudice in favour of the Queen, and against her brutal husband, who did not attempt to conceal his joy at her death, and had two months before sworn that he would no longer endure the opposition of the Queen and Princess, and that the next Parliament must rid him of them.*

Vengeance was not long in overtaking Anne Boleyn. On the very day of the funeral of the Queen, she miscarried of a male child, and her doom was sealed. A few days before, the Marchioness of Exeter had reported to Chapuys words said to have been uttered by the King, 'that he had been 'drawn into the marriage by witchcraft; God had shewn 'His displeasure by denying him male children by her, and 'therefore he might take another wife.' Whether M. Friedmann's account of the mode in which Cromwell contrived to get up the false charge against Anne, which eventually led to her execution, is true or not, we cannot decide. To disprove it is of the greatest importance to Mr. Froude, if his argument for the conscientiousness of the King is to be maintained. It must be allowed that M. Friedmann, like his predecessor, M. Bergenroth, is apt to jump at conclusions on very insufficient evidence, and, perhaps, this is the case as regards his decision on the death of Catherine of Aragon and the execution of Anne Boleyn. We observe that Mr. Froude has instituted no defence for the King for his inconsistency in forcing Cranmer to declare the marriage null and void, and then executing Anne for a crime of which, unless she were the King's wife, she could not have been guilty. As Dr. Lingard has observed—If his object had been to place Jane Seymour in her place, the divorce of Anne without her execution, or the execution without the divorce, would have been sufficient for his purpose. But he seems to have pursued her with insatiable hatred. Not content with taking her life, he made her feel in every way a wife and a mother could feel. He stamped on her character the infamy of adultery and incest; he deprived her of the name and the right of wife and queen, and bastardised the daughter whom he acknowledged as his child. The speeches and the reticence of Anne, and the five gentlemen who were executed on her account, are equally unintelligible on the score of their guilt or of their innocence. Mr. Froude, after

* Chapuys to Charles, Nov. 6, 1535.

quoting a letter from Sir Francis Weston, in which he speaks, in the most general terms, of the offences done unto his father, mother, and wife, especially the latter, concludes that this amounts to a confession of his adultery with Anne Boleyn, and here he rides the high horse, and avows that 'if any one can believe, after reading it, that the writer 'was about to die for a crime of which he was innocent, I 'shall not attempt to reason with such a person' (p. 424). Neither shall we attempt to argue the matter with Mr. Froude; but shall content ourselves with the avowal that to us the letter seems to prove nothing at all; and, again, we agree with Dr. Lingard, that the best solution of the difficulty is to suppose that no person was allowed to speak at his execution, without a solemn promise to say nothing in disparagement of the judgement under which he suffered. If Anne Boleyn had been promised that her life would be taken by the sword instead of the more horrible death by burning at the stake, it is perhaps intelligible that she should have spoken of the King as her sovereign and master, 'the 'most godly, noble and gentle prince there is.'

It was absolutely necessary for the vindication of Henry's character for Mr. Froude to extend his narrative of the divorce of Catherine to the execution of her rival, and to show that Anne had deserved the fate which she incurred; and it would be of manifest value for his defence of the King if he could succeed in showing that he had felt any sorrow for the loss of the woman whose charms had exercised for so long a time such a fascination over him. And so he professes entirely to disbelieve the story so graphically told by Chapuys of May 17, two days before the execution, of the King's 'going about banqueting with ladies, sometimes remaining after midnight, and returning by the 'river,' and of his 'having lately supped with several ladies 'in the house of the Bishop of Carlisle, and shewed an 'extravagant joy,' as the Bishop had told him the next morning. Mr. Froude considers that he has triumphantly destroyed the credit to be attached to this information by checking it against another letter from a writer who had been unable to obtain admittance to the King's presence for a whole fortnight before the date of the letter, which is May 19, the day of the execution of Anne. 'His Grace,' he says, 'came not abroad this fortnight, except it was in the 'garden or in his boat, when it may become no man to interrupt him.' Upon turning to the letter itself we find that Mr. Froude has left out the important words which show

that there is no sort of inconsistency between the two accounts. Mr. Gairdner's Calendar gives it as follows: 'His Grace came not abroad, except it were in the garden 'and in his boat *at night* (at which times it may become no 'man to prevent him), this 14 days.' Mr. Froude admits the awkward fact that before the fortnight had expired the King had resolved to do what the Council recommended—marry Jane Seymour, and this he did promptly, to close further solicitation from foreign princes. But he forgets to tell us that Cranmer had been instructed to draw up a dispensation for the marriage of the King and Jane, and that the dispensation was signed on the very day of the execution. Nor does he mention that the King on May 25 denied that he had fixed on a wife, telling the French ambassador that he was still at liberty. Nor, again, does he tell us of the talk of foreign courts of the attentions paid to Jane Seymour before any charge was brought against Anne Boleyn, nor of the opinion that had been formed of the new Queen, as reported by Dr. Ortiz, that at the time of her marriage she had been for some time pregnant. In the letter written to Granvelle on the same day on which he sent to the Emperor his account of Anne's death, Chapuys says that there are still two English gentlemen detained on her account. One of these was Sir Thomas Wyatt, about whom his father, Sir Henry, wrote a week earlier to Cromwell, asking when it would please the King to release him, and show to the world 'that this punishment that he hath for this matter is more 'for the displeasure that he hath done to God otherwise.' This alludes to the connexion which Wyatt had had with Anne Boleyn, and which he had acknowledged to the King before the marriage took place, in order, if possible, to prevent it, though the King's infatuation was such that he took no further notice than to send Wyatt away. Mr. Froude has not alluded to this story, which, of course, would scarcely add to the weight of infamy which on the supposition of Anne's guilt attaches to her name. Probably, however, most readers will acquiesce in the opinion of the Queen of Hungary, as expressed to her brother Ferdinand, King of the Romans, May 25, 1536, that 'as none but the organist 'confessed, nor herself either, people think he invented this 'device to get rid of her. Anyhow, not much wrong can be 'done to her even in being suspected as *méchante*, for that 'has long been her character.' Her opinion of Henry is added in the words, 'When he is tired of his new wife, he 'will find some occasion to quit himself of her too.'

Had we been writing the history of the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, we should have ended our narrative with the execution of Anne Boleyn. Poetical justice would have been satisfied, and the wrongs of the Spanish princess would have been sufficiently avenged in the tragical death of the vile upstart who had supplanted her. But Mr. Froude was writing a drama, the purpose of which was to show how results sanctify the means which are used to compass them; and so he once more lifts the curtain, and tells us of the failure of the rebellions in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire which occurred in the autumn and winter of the year in which Henry had married his third wife. Unfortunately for the insurgents, there was no leader who could organise the rebellion, and, though the whole country was ready to rise against the tyrant, there were no means of communication between the north and the south. The proper time to rise was now past, and the want of a concerted plan was fatal to the partial attempts that were made to avert the fall of the monasteries in the north. The failure of the Pilgrimage of Grace is dwelt upon by the author with exulting complacency as completing the success of the Reformation in a battle, as he describes it, 'fought 'out gallantly between two principles—a crisis in the eternal 'struggle between the old and the new' (p. 463); and he appears to take the utmost delight in telling the story of the three hundred persons who were hanged for taking up arms in defence of their religion, and speaks of the spectacle of priests and friars hanging from the gallows in their sacerdotal habits, not as evidence of the cruelty of the sentence under which they suffered, but as a 'didactic spectacle of 'some scores of reverend persons swinging for the crows 'to eat in the sacred dress of their order,' a severe lesson required to teach a superstitious world that the clerical immunities existed no longer, and that priests who broke the law would suffer like common mortals. And so the drama appropriately closes with the remark that the victory won by Protestantism over Catholicism in the sixteenth century was a victory of right over wrong, and that we have no need to blush for the actions of the men who achieved it, and 'won for mankind the spiritual liberty which is now 'the law of the world.'

ART. IX.—1. *Mahdism and the Egyptian Sudan.* By Major F. R. WINGATE, F.S.O., R.A., A.A.G. Egyptian Army. London: 1891.

2. *The Ruin of the Soudan.* By HENRY RUSSELL and WILLIAM GATTIE. London: 1892.

HISTORY shows few stranger freaks of circumstance than those which connect Great Britain with the cruel fortunes of the Sudan. The very name of a territory, described by General Gordon as 'larger than Germany, France, 'and Spain together,' and referred to, with curious want of scale, in a Foreign Office telegram as a 'province' of Egypt, was almost unknown in this country till 1883. Nevertheless, a few years later, the question of the measure of the responsibility of a British Government for life and order in these dim regions came to be hotly discussed, and to this day political capital is sought on the banks of the Upper Nile, or in the deserts which border the Red Sea. 'The slave trade and its eager opponents, oppression and consequent rebellion, real religious fanaticism and imposture inspired by ambition, intricate tribal politics and gross military blunders, ignorance of every description—all have been contributing causes to the consummation of a tragedy as terribly complete as any which history records.

The Roman sway in Egypt extended little further south than the Second Cataract. No attempt to subjugate the vast tract now known as the Sudan was made till 1820, when Mehemet Ali, in an evil hour for Egypt and for the Arab race, conceived the idea of employing the energies of his mercenaries in southern conquests. His forces reached Khartoum, and, dividing, pushed forward along the Blue and White Niles. Sennar, which a hundred years before was a great city renowned for its learning, fell to Ismail Pasha, who, on his return journey in 1822, was treacherously burned alive at Shendi. Mehemet Ali, however, maintained his grip on the new territory, and in 1838 visited the Sudan. In 1841 a rebellion broke out, which was suppressed, with the result of a great extension of Egyptian rule. During the mild reign of Said Pasha some attempt was made to establish an orderly and beneficent government; but the amelioration of the condition of the Sudanese proved short-lived, and further disturbances occurred, culminating in 1865 in a revolt of the negro troops of the Khedive in the province of Taka. Meanwhile the travels of Speke and

Grant added largely to the geography of the Sudan, and Sir Samuel Baker tracked the White Nile to the Albert Nyanza. The pressure of the Powers, and especially of England, being heavily brought to bear against the slave trade, Ismail Pasha determined to absorb the Equatorial Provinces. About the year 1870, therefore, a further great extension of Egyptian rule in the Sudan took place. Sir Samuel Baker, in the name of Egypt, annexed Gondokoro and established posts nearly as far south as the equator, while separate expeditions penetrated into the regions of the Bahr-el-Ghazal, and occupied Senhit, claimed as the northern province of Abyssinia. In 1874 Colonel Gordon followed Sir Samuel Baker, and in 1877 became governor-general of the Sudan, returning to Cairo in August 1879, to be succeeded by Raouf Pasha, whom he had at least twice dismissed for misrule and oppression. The smouldering discontent of the tribes quickly assumed an active form, and a leader able to take full advantage of the situation was not wanting.

When, in 1882, after the halting and ineffectual measures described in this Journal,* military intervention in Egypt was decided upon, no thought of the fate of the Sudan seems to have suggested itself. Arabi and the revolted army were to be crushed. The policy tardily adopted went no further; the hapless Egyptian garrisons scattered in detachments along the endless valley of the Nile, and over the vast deserts of the Sudan, were forgotten.

Thus the following strange situation arose. The entire home army of a weak and disorganised Power, holding with feeble grasp a huge territory in which revolt had already broken out, was suddenly destroyed. The ruler whose position the rebellion of that army had jeopardised was firmly re-established by British bayonets; but no force remained behind him save that wielded by a British general. The situation in Egypt proper was restored; but what was to become of the thousands of troops, their wives and families, and the host of civil employes scattered over the Sudan? Every vestige of real power in Egypt having passed into the hands of Great Britain at Tel-el-Kebir, their fate virtually hung upon the action of British ministers, who at this time were probably unaware of their very existence. Given such conditions, the chances of a successful solution of a difficult problem whose data were never fully understood, could not be great. Even so, failure almost absolutely

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 159, April 1888.

complete, entailing slaughter and suffering almost unexampled, would hardly have been anticipated. Military operations, carried on regardless of cost, might at least have been so planned as to retrieve previous errors. It was not so. From first to last the mirage of the Sudan deserts seems to have deluded the British Government, its agents in Egypt, and its advisers at home.

The story of the Sudan from 1882 to the present time may be told from two different points of view. The mass of information of varying value which has come to hand, the statements of the many refugees, and the contents of captured documents, may be woven into a narrative. This is the method which Major Wingate has adopted. Again, the interaction of the British and Egyptian Governments and their varying influence upon the fortunes of the Sudan can be studied in blue books, and, neglecting the history of the revolt in the remote provinces, the interest may be made to centre on the tragedy of Khartoum and the known course of events near the shores of the Red Sea. This, with a running commentary—in which blame is freely, if not always judiciously, distributed—is the general plan followed by Mr. Russell and Mr. Gattie. No two books, dealing with the same subject, could well be more different in aims, manner, treatment, and in conclusions; but each has a distinct value in throwing light on dark pages of the history of a dark land.

The keynote of Major Wingate's work is expressed in its first title. 'Mahdism' supplied the power which, for a time at least, welded together the scattered peoples of the Sudan; which made peaceable tribesmen fight with reckless gallantry; which, like a storm wave, swept over a vast tract of country, submerging the ill-fated garrisons which Egypt was unable, and Great Britain unwilling, to succour. The strength of the book lies in the vivid picture conveyed of a great semi-religious movement; its weakness is to be found in a certain evident want of grasp, and in the admittedly official character with which it is invested.

The so-called garrisons of the Sudan are well described as 'so many fathers of large families, more or less properly acquired and domesticated in a foreign land. Had they had no weapons they might have made good colonists, and could at least have introduced a cumbrous agriculture. But the prestige which had first attached to their superior weapons and comparative education inclined them to tyranny. Their function was that of honest countrymen sharing in the villany of the brigands from the Levant and Asia Minor, who wrung money, women, and drink from a miserable population.'

The picture is not in the least overdrawn. Writing from Khartoum in 1883, Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart stated: 'Pro-
'bably for every pound that reaches the treasury, these men
'(Bashî Bazouks) rob an equal amount from the people.' Sennar, once a flourishing town, he describes as 'a miser-
'able, poverty-stricken place,' whose octroi farmer ingenu-
ously explained that 'he robbed the poor, but did not
'meddle with the wealthy.' In the year 1881 no less than
1,442 water-wheels were abandoned on account of the tax-
ation. The Sudan was, in fact, being steadily ruined by
Egyptian misrule in every form, and Egyptian power was
represented by an inert mass of undrilled and undisciplined
men with rifles.

Excluding the mixed population of the towns and villages, the negroid tribes in the mountainous regions of Darfur, and the cattle-owning negroids of the Equatorial Provinces, the distinctively Arab races may be divided into two great groups—camel-breeding Arabs, extending down to the 13th parallel of latitude, and Baggara, or cattle-owning Arabs, who dwell below this parallel, along the White Nile and the Bahr-el-Ghazal, and in the angle between the two Niles.* The former are the carriers of the Sudan, largely dependent, therefore, on trade, and generally unwarlike. The latter form the slave-dealing class, and, 'well fed on
'meat, accustomed to defend their flocks, they are inured to
'war, and in chronic readiness to plunder.' For them the suppression of the slave trade, which Colonel Gordon sternly enforced wherever his strong arm reached, implied interference with habits long cherished. Even their taxes could be paid in slaves, for, under the rule of pashas sent from Cairo, there were ample opportunities for evading what may have been the wishes of the Khedive, and, as Gessi Pasha shows,† Egyptian officials profitably participated in the iniquitous traffic. But with an English Governor-General in power, slave-dealing suddenly became impossible without certain risk, as Zubair found to his cost. Gordon gone, nothing remained but mudirs and inspectors supported by a rabble of disorganised troops.

'These men, with tarboushes and uniforms, were now left to themselves. Surely with all their insolence they were a farce. True they had rifles and cannon, but the experiment of resisting their authority was worth trying.'

* The ethnographical distribution is well shown in Major Wingate's map.

† Seven Years in the Soudan. London: 1892.

Thus, throughout the Egyptian Sudan, the fire of revolt lay smouldering. Misrule and hideous oppression were working out their inevitable result. Only a leader was needed capable of uniting the people against the enfeebled tyrant; and such a leader, among a Mahommedan population, must claim supernatural sanction, and must show himself successful in war. The necessary qualifications were found in Mohammed Ahmed, the son of a carpenter of Dongola.

In an interesting first chapter, Major Wingate explains how the tenets of the Mussulman religion lend themselves to the appearance of a Mahdi at any national crisis. By the Sunnis, as by the Jews, the advent of a Messiah is expected. Among the Shia, the legend of a Mahdi, who disappeared and may return at any time, is cherished. 'It is one of the most singular things in religious history that Egypt has had at the same moment within, or in close proximity to, its boundaries, two thriving Mahdis—one of each kind.' For the leader of the agricultural and prosperous sect of the Senussiyeh, whose lodges are spread over the oases lying to the west of Egypt, extending to the ancient and little known port of Tobruk, on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, has been proclaimed as the Sunni Messiah, and duly attested by effective miracles. El Senussi, described as 'an able man,' with 'brave and war-like agents,' took no part in revolt against an oppression which affected few of his followers, but may yet play an important rôle in the future history of the Sudan. 'Mahdiism' deals, therefore, only with the religious and military movement inspired by Mohammed Ahmed.

Born in 1848, the Mahdi, whom fate brought into conflict with the power of Great Britain, was thirty-three years old when, in 1881, the government and the finances of Egypt were threatened by the growing power of Arabi. But 'at twenty-two he was already a sheikh with a great reputation for sanctity; and his preaching was renowned far and wide. Men wept and beat their breasts at his moving words.' The fikis, religious teachers of the Sudan, whose numbers had much increased of late years, came and went; Abba Island, where Mohammed Ahmed had taken up his abode, became the centre of the propaganda by which the seeds of insurrection were sown broadcast over the land. The day came at last when, to a chosen band, the preacher announced in secrecy, 'I am the Mahdi.'

Abu Saoud, a notorious scoundrel, who may probably have

prearranged matters, was sent by Raouf Pasha with 200 troops to arrest the rising leader. The troops were surprised and killed, and thus, in August 1881, the signal for revolt was given and the Mahdi stood forth as its champion. To what extent the preparations for the movement had progressed will never be exactly known; but it appears certain that Mohammed Ahmed acted under a plan deliberately framed. In a huge country with few and difficult communications, peopled by tribes whose interests were by no means homogeneous and whose modes of life differed widely, such a movement could not be simultaneous. One interest was common, however, to the wretched population. Oppression in its worst forms reigned everywhere, and the Mahdi, in appealing to the tribesmen to cast off for ever the intolerable yoke of Egypt, could be understood by all. As Mr. Russell states, Besati Bey, ex-secretary to Colonel Gordon, pointed out from the first 'that the real reason of the rebellion was misgovernment and oppression, and that all the Mahdi did was to apply a match to the fully prepared tinder.' In 'misgovernment and oppression' lay the opportunity and the strength of Mahdism.

Even so, in such a country, the movement was at first easy to arrest if there had been available power. A succession of reverses at the outset would have speedily discredited the divine mission of Mohammed Ahmed, to the sustained belief in which military prestige was essential. The government of the Sudan was, however, feeble as well as corrupt; the troops were for the most part sunk in military decrepitude. To crown all, the Egyptian military system was shattered to pieces in September 1882, and the government, together with the control of finance, virtually passed into the power of another nation which knew not, and cared not for, the Sudan. Thus, as shown in Major Wingate's excellent series of maps, the green wave of Arab revolt swept over the land, encircling the doomed garrisons abandoned to their fate.

In selecting the Baggara tribes as his first instruments of vengeance, and allying himself with their emirs by many marriages, the Mahdi showed much military astuteness. Still smarting from the blows of Gordon and of Gessi, the cattle-owning and slave-dealing Arabs, with their strong sense of injury and their warlike proclivities, were exactly suited to the requirements of the cause. To the Baggara country, therefore, the Mahdi directed his hegira after arranging for the siege of Sennar. Raouf Pasha was recalled to Cairo in March 1882, but previous to the arrival of

Abd-el-Kader, his successor, Geigler Pasha, the acting governor, inflicted several defeats upon the Arabs and temporarily raised the siege of Sennar. On June 7 a force of 6,000 men, under Yusef Pasha, which had advanced from Fashoda against the Mahdi, was surprised and nearly annihilated. This was a considerable victory, providing the Arabs with arms and ammunition, and supplying in some measure the military prestige necessary to the cause. In Kordofan, Tayara and Birket quickly fell, and a few days before the rout of the Egyptian army at Tel-el-Kebir, the Mahdi with a large force arrived before El Obeid. In Darfur, Slatin Bey held his own and inflicted several defeats upon the Arabs, temporarily checking the progress of the revolt in his province. In the Bahr-el-Ghazal, with its eight small garrisons scattered over a country 'about five times as big as England,' Lupton, among his mountains and forests, defied the Mahdi's emissaries, winning several successes. Emin, in the Equatorial Provinces, was at present in no danger. With this exception, almost the whole of the Egyptian Sudan south of Khartoum was in open rebellion by the close of the year 1882. 'So far,' writes Major Wingate, 'the record is one of wavering and hesitation on the one side, and patient preparation for the inevitable on the other. Mahommed Ahmed had but to wait for the fruit to ripen and drop into his mouth.'

Yet under the circumstances it is difficult to see what could have been done at this stage. In a country so vast, with communications so obstructed, effective action from a central point was difficult in the extreme. A governor-general with the genius of Gordon, seconded by such a lieutenant as Gessi, might doubtless at this period have crushed out Mahdiism as represented by Mohammed Ahmed. Had the doomed garrisons been composed of troops fit to take the field, instead of those much married persons in uniform, such men as Lupton and Slatin might have continued to sway their provinces. All the conditions for suppressing at its outset a wide-spread revolt, which drew its strength from the misery and oppression of the people, were wanting. What could Abd-el-Kader do? How far could Egypt, then lying in the hollow of the hand of England, support him?

Such chances as remained of saving the situation in the Sudan, or of withdrawing the garrisons, depended on decisions to be taken at Cairo—decisions for which British ministers could not cast off responsibility by mere disavowal.

To trace the fluctuating and involved interaction between the British Government and its military advisers, the British representative and military authorities at Cairo, and the Egyptian Government and its officials in the Sudan, forms no part of the task which Major Wingate has undertaken. It would have been better, therefore, had he abstained from all allusion to this aspect of the matter, by which the possibility of creating an erroneous impression would have been easily avoided. The Egyptian blue books are singularly incomplete, and the information vouchsafed everywhere suggests information withheld. The selection of extracts supplied by Mr. Russell embody the most important of the published communications during 1883; but do not by any means bear out all his comments. While he severely condemns the British Government for overruling the opinions of its representatives, his quoted despatches clearly show the perplexing and frequently conflicting nature of those opinions. It is impossible to apportion the blame for the disasters in the Sudan without knowledge which is never likely to be available. The existing evidence, however, suffices to establish certain deductions. Her Majesty's Government, from the first, naturally desired to avoid all interference in, and responsibility for, Sudan affairs. To carry out this policy consistently proved utterly impossible, and, as might easily have been foreseen, the inexorable force of events drove them to direct intervention. The Egyptian Government also naturally desired to retain its hold upon the Sudan, but were utterly ignorant of the extent of the means necessary for the purpose, even if they had possessed those means. Throughout the whole miserable history of the circumstances which led to the tragedy of Khartoum, not one of the advisers of the Government, in Egypt or at home, civil or military, seems ever to have attained a real grasp of the situation, or upheld a consistent policy. Mirage seems to have deluded all alike. The fatal expeditions of Hicks and Baker Pashas, the circumstances attending General Gordon's heroic mission, the two British expeditions to Suakin, the impossible plan of campaign evolved in London in the early part of 1884, the later gross impolicy on the Red Sea littoral—all are explicable only by mirage.

'The year 1882,' states Major Wingate, 'closed on both El Obeid and Bara in the greatest distress from want of food, and hemmed in by countless numbers of the enemy. . . . Abd-el-Kader Pasha urgently telegraphed to Cairo for 10,000 additional troops, without which he declared it impossible to crush the revolt. He moreover said that, if these troops did not come at once, four times the number would be required to re-establish the Government authority in the Sudan.'

Where were these troops to be found? On whose responsibility were they to be sent? Who would command them? Meanwhile, Abd-el-Kader seems to have done his best with the force at disposal, gaining two successes, and again raising the siege of Sennar. On February 20, when preparing to march against Karkoj, he was 'superseded in his military capacity by Suliman Niazi Pasha,' and, on March 26, Ala-ed-Din Pasha, a Turkish cavalry officer, was proclaimed governor-general of the revolted Sudan.

The troops, utterly routed and cowed at Tel-el-Kel, were 'gathered up' and 'collected together in chains' for slaughter.

'The recruits wept in their chains. But by December 1882, 5,000 were poured into the seething cauldron of revolt; and by March 4, 1883, the ill-fated General Hicks found himself with nine other European officers at Khartoum, at the head of 10,000 weeping soldiers, with the usual proportion of officers, many of them ignorant and incapable men. Then, that no embarrassment might be wanting, jealousies were stirred up among the various high officials.'

After raising in few words questions of the greatest importance, Major Wingate proceeds to tell the ghastly story of the fate of Hicks's expedition in the words of a certain Mohammed Nur-el-Barudi, who deserted the Mahdi's cause before the affair at Toski in 1889, and 'was of considerable use in the intelligence department.'

Mr. Russell's extracts, however, throw some light on the causes of this tragedy, even though much remains to be explained.

'The broad facts of the situation,' he states, 'demonstrate that, notwithstanding apparent concurrence in certain instances, the objects of each of the parties, instead of being identical, were diametrically opposed. The Egyptian Government wished to retain the Soudan, while her Majesty's Government, with qualifications, wished it to be abandoned.'

Up to the last, General Hicks corresponded direct with Sir E. Malet. It was to her Majesty's representative at Cairo that he looked to assist him in combating the intrigues set on foot against his authority, and to whom he twice tendered his resignation. It was Sir E. Malet who telegraphed on July 23: 'I hope that this concession being made (the promise to recall Suliman Pasha) you will find your task easier and your way clear;' and, four days later: 'I presume that you do not press your resignation, as Suliman Pasha is to be recalled.' It was Sir E. Malet who, on August 18, 1883, telegraphed: 'I

'congratulate you on your appointment as commander-in-chief.' Yet, during this period, when the fate of Hicks trembled in the balance, he was careful to explain to Cherif Pasha (May 22) that, 'although General Hicks finds it 'convenient' to communicate with Lord Dufferin or with me, 'it must not be supposed that we endorse in any way the 'contents of his telegrams. . . . Her Majesty's Government are in no way responsible for the operations in the 'Sudan, which have been undertaken under the authority 'of his Highness's Government, or for the appointment or 'actions of General Hicks.' Whether her Majesty's Government ever realised the somewhat equivocal position which their representative had taken up in regard to General Hicks, or received from him any warning of the extremely critical nature of the operations about to take place, and of the certain consequences which would follow disaster in Kordofan, cannot be stated.

The views of General Hicks himself are, however, clear. He knew and reported faithfully the deplorable state of his force. Realising the hopelessness of a position weakened by divided responsibility and intrigue, he twice resigned. Although somewhat underrating the power of the religious fanaticism which lay behind the Mahdi movement, he was fully alive to the military dangers of the situation, and to the necessity for keeping open communications between Suakin and Berber. Finally, the despatch of his rabble forces to disaster was against his judgement. 'I am convinced,' he telegraphed, as late as August 5, 'that it 'would be best to keep the two rivers and province of 'Sennar, and wait for Kordofan to settle itself.' It must be assumed that the 'ill-fated General,' with his 'weeping 'soldiers,' lacking alike proper equipment and loyal support, was against his will ordered away from Khartoum to utter disaster in the waterless deserts of Kordofan. Such an order could only have come from the ministers of the Khedive, at this period puppets in the hand of Great Britain. This was no case in which wisdom merely follows the event. Soldiers whose calibre was shown at Tel-el-Kebir, and who 'wept in their chains,' were not the men to overcome the fighting tribes of the Sudan, flushed with the conquest of El Obeid and Bara. Their general himself had testified to the hopeless inefficiency and the many unfulfilled requirements of his army. Was any clear warning conveyed to her Majesty's Government by its responsible advisers? On this point the blue books appear to be silent.

Stress has been laid on the proceedings taken during this period, because the lurid light of later disasters has blinded the public judgement. No subsequent events carry more blame than those from which they sprung. Nothing illustrates more completely the failure to grasp the situation than the anomalous and impossible position taken up in regard to Hicks Pasha and his hapless expedition. Previous to this irretrievable step, 'there is little doubt,' as Mr. Russell states, 'that arrangements might have been made for the evacuation by the garrisons of the various outlying districts without bloodshed.' Had General Hicks been allowed to carry out the policy he urged, the situation might have been saved. Now all was jeopardised, and, as Major Wingate writes, 'everywhere—from Dongola to the Equator, and from the Red Sea to the confines of Waddai—the belief was universal that at last the true Mahdi had appeared.' Even when the inevitable had occurred, 'this appalling massacre took place so far away from Cairo that it was not understood aright.'

The darkly gathering rumours of disaster had, however, suggested definite conclusions to her Majesty's representative, and on November 19 Sir E. Baring telegraphed: 'If General Hicks's army is destroyed, it is nearly certain that the Egyptian Government will lose the whole of the Soudan, unless some assistance from outside is given.' He further states that a demand for 'English or Indian troops' was 'not at all improbable,' and advised that, if defeat had occurred, the Egyptian Government should 'accept the fact,' and withdraw to some post on the Nile, General Wood's army being, however, 'retained in Egypt proper.' Lord Granville, on the following day, replied: 'We cannot lend English or Indian troops. If consulted, recommend abandonment of the Soudan within certain limits.' To carry out this policy literally involved the abandonment of some 30,000 men, with their wives and families, scattered over the face of the Sudan, of whose existence the Foreign Office was probably unaware. Some attempt to save them must be made, and, accordingly, Sir E. Baring reported that the Egyptian Government was about to despatch '2,000 gendarmerie and 6,000 Bedouins to Suakin' to open the line of communication with Berber, and adds that 'there appears to be a general opinion' that Khartoum could not be held, and that 'it will be necessary to fall back on Berber.' Colonel Coetlogon, from Khartoum, was at the same time urging a retreat on Berber, and the opening of communication

with Suakin. Neither operation was ever carried out. The '6,000 Bedouins' naturally proved a myth. 'Her Majesty's Government,' on November 25, 'can do nothing in the matter which would throw upon them the responsibility for operations in the Soudan.' On December 3, Sir E. Baring, at the close of a long despatch,* powerfully argued against all British interference in the affairs of the Sudan. On December 13, 'Her Majesty's Government recommend the ministers of Khedive to come to an early decision to abandon all territory south of Assouan, or, at least, of Wady Halfa.' They have no objection to the employment of Turkish troops, paid by the Sultan, and operating from Suakin. They consider the proposed employment of Zubair (at Suakin) 'inexpedient, both politically and as regards the slave trade.'

The year 1883 brought to the Mahdi an immense access of power and of prestige. It was estimated that he 'had gained possession of over 20,000 rifles, 19 guns, and a vast store of ammunition.' In Darfur, Slatin Bey, whose officers and officials had become thoroughly infected with 'the spirit of revolt,' and who never received the order to concentrate his garrisons at El Fasher and return to Khartoum, was forced to surrender. A part of Lupton's force in Bahr-el-Ghazal had been destroyed, and he himself, short of ammunition, had retired on Dera Suliman, his most westerly station. Emin, in the Equatorial Provinces, was face to face with widespread disaffection, and Lado was threatened. In the Eastern Sudan, Osman Digna, a noted slave dealer of Suakin, who bitterly resented the effects of the Anglo-Egyptian Slave Convention, had espoused Mahdism in 1882. Created emir, he began to terrorise the neighbourhood of Suakin, and besiege Sinkat and Tokar, while Mustafa Hadal was despatched to attack Kassala. Successes quickly fell to Osman, who, on October 16 and November 4, cut up Egyptian reinforcements bound for Sinkat, and on December 2 destroyed 700 black troops and Bashi-Bazuks, near Tamanieb. Baker Pasha, with a force over 2,500 strong, principally gendarmerie, and ten British officers, arrived at Suakin on December 23, and began 'a strict course of drill for the great enterprise he had in hand.' The general conditions were almost identical with those under which Hicks had been sent to massacre at Kashgil. Was this ever pointed out to her Majesty's

* Blue Book, Egypt, No. 1, 1884.

Government? Were they warned of the certain consequences of disaster? The danger was fully realised by the Khedive himself, who, in a private letter to Baker Pasha, stated :—

‘I write you to act with the greatest prudence on account of the insufficiency of the forces under your command. . . . If, in the event of the situation improving, you should consider an action necessary, I rely on your prudence and ability not to engage the enemy except under the most favourable conditions.’

Up to the end of 1883 the course recommended by Sir E. Baring, of maintaining a policy of non-interference in, and irresponsibility for, any action taken in regard to the Sudan, was followed. The employment of Zubair at Suakin had, however, been vetoed by her Majesty’s Government—a proceeding the inconsistency of which their representative at Cairo at once pointed out. Advice had been furnished gratis to the Egyptian ministry; but no exercise of direct authority by the paramount Power occurred. Public opinion in England having been aroused on behalf of the garrisons of the Sudan, Lord Granville, on December 1, proposed the employment of General Gordon. Sir E. Baring replied, next day, that the Egyptian Government was ‘very much averse’ to the step, and that ‘I think it wise to leave the whole responsibility of Sudan affairs to them, and not to press them on the subject.’

The opening of the year 1884 marks a distinct change of front on the part of her Majesty’s Government.* On January 4 Sir E. Baring was informed that the policy adopted by her Majesty’s Government, in regard to the evacuation of the Sudan, was to be insisted upon. Cherif Pasha at once resigned office, and Nubar Pasha undertook the formation of a complaisant ministry, stipulating, however, for the retention of Suakin. Further steps soon followed. On January 11 Sir E. Baring did ‘not think that the services of General Gordon or Sir C. Wilson can be utilised at present;’ but on the 16th a different view must have presented itself, and Lord Granville was informed: ‘With reference to my telegram of to-day and your telegram of yesterday, General Gordon would be best man.’ On the 18th, General Gordon left London on an heroic mission of which the con-

* This change seems to have been due to an intimation from the Egyptian Government that, in view of their military impotence, the retrocession of the Eastern Sudan to the Porte was about to be notified.

ditions were little understood. Direct responsibility was thus assumed by her Majesty's Government, and, at the same time, the public avowal of the abandonment of the Sudan naturally produced the worst possible effect. On February 4 Baker Pasha's disorganised force, in a single unwieldy mass, not completely formed, was caught by a far inferior body of Arabs near El Teb, and utterly routed, with a loss of 2,373 out of 3,715. British blue-jackets and marines were landed at Suakin by Admiral Hewett on the 6th, and on the 9th, authority, military and civil, was assumed by British officers, the British Government accepting henceforth the responsibility for the defence of the place. The fall of Sinkat, and the massacre of gallant Tewfik Bey and his whole garrison, almost within sight of British ships of war, created a profound impression. Tokar was believed to be in the greatest straits. Non-intervention was flung to the winds. On the 24th, a British force, under Major-General Graham, landed at Trinkitat, to learn that Tokar had already fallen. No massacre appears to have occurred. The place was simply surrendered, possibly because the bulk of the population was opposed to resistance. Provisions were abundant; some 45,000 rounds of ammunition remained; the total loss during the siege was trifling. Nevertheless General Graham was ordered to advance, and the first conflict between British troops and the Sudanese occurred on February 29. There could be no doubt of the result. Bad generalship alone can give a chance of success, against well-disciplined British troops, to Arabs, however recklessly gallant, depending mainly on the spear and the sword. Nearly 3,000 tribesmen were killed, with a total British loss of 189 killed and 155 wounded. On March 14 a severe action was fought at Tamai, in which the total British loss was 220, of whom half were killed; and that of the Arabs at least 3,000.

The evacuation of the Sudan had been decided upon; Tokar was known to have fallen. The only possible justification for this slaughter was either the safety of Suakin, or the opening of the Berber route, for which General Gordon and Colonel Stewart, who had reached Khartoum on February 18, strongly pressed.* All danger at Suakin

* Lord E. Fitzmaurice stated on March 25 that it was 'of the very greatest importance, with a view to keeping up communications with Khartoum, that the road between Suakin and Berber should be kept open,' and suggested that this should be done by Indian troops.

had passed, and one British battalion, aided by the navy, would easily have rendered the place impregnable to Arab attack. Both General Graham and Lieutenant-Colonel Herbert Stewart were eager that a movement on Berber should be made, and at this period there was no real military risk. Other counsels unfortunately prevailed, and Sir E. Baring, on March 4, 'cannot agree with the proposal . . . that a 'force of British or Indian cavalry should be sent through 'from Suakin to Berber.' Yet only twelve days later he telegraphed: 'It has now become of the utmost importance 'not only to open the road between Suakin and Berber, but 'to come to terms with the tribes between Berber and 'Khartoum.* Some allowance must be made for the difficulties of a Government receiving conflicting advice from Egypt, and perhaps strongly urged against the measure by the military authorities at home. The chance was lost. The natural outlet for the endangered garrisons was closed, and the fall of Berber, the strategic importance of which, frequently urged by General Gordon, appears never to have been recognised, increased all the military difficulties. The withdrawal of General Graham's force had the inevitable result of throwing the well-affected tribesmen into the hands of Osman Digna, and advancing the wave of Mahdism, while it led directly to the fall of Berber.

No Government was ever more averse to wanton bloodshed than that of Mr. Gladstone. Yet by the irony of fate this Government must be held responsible for slaughter as purposeless and as fruitless as any by which the pages of history are stained. England had no quarrel with the Sudanese, whose territory she had forced helpless Egypt to abandon, whose revolt against grinding oppression might have evoked her sympathies. The only possible justification for the fighting of March 1884 was to aid in the rescue of the garrisons, and this justification breaks down absolutely in face of the decision not to open the Suakin-Berber route.

The pitiful story of the vicissitudes of Khartoum and of General Gordon's lonely struggle against forces all too great for his unaided strength, has been often told. The extracts given by Mr. Russell recall its principal features

* This change of view seems to have arisen merely from the cutting of the telegraph wire between Shendi and Berber, a contingency probable from the first.

with painful distinctness; but the blame, if blame there is, cannot be apportioned so easily as he seems to think.

Only the most general outline of events can here be given. General Gordon's mission from her Majesty's Government was to report 'on the military situation in the Sudan, and on the measures which it may be advisable to take for the security of the Egyptian garrisons. . . .' He was, further, in the words of the Khedive of January 26, to 'take the necessary steps for establishing an organised government in the different provinces of the Sudan.' 'He has been left,' states Sir E. Baring, on February 1, 'the widest discretionary power.' There seems little doubt that the full extent of the difficulties of these tasks was not recognised either in England, at Cairo, or by General Gordon himself.* Mahdiism was an unknown force. The hope was that the prestige of a great name would suffice to secure the objects in view, and avert the necessity for military operations, which Egypt could not possibly undertake, and her Majesty's Government was naturally anxious to avoid. To the shrewd judgement of M. Waddington, however, doubt evidently presented itself, and he pointed out to Lord Granville 'that the decision was the right and prudent one, though it might be much criticised if any disaster were to occur at Khartoum.' 'I admitted,' wrote Lord Granville, 'that such an occurrence would be likely to produce an unfavourable impression.' General Gordon's first request was for five British officers; but he emphasised his opinion that 'if there is the slightest chance of an outcry in England in sending these officers, do not send them, for I can do without them with an increase of time.' From Berber, on February 11, he proposed 'to engage 3,000 Turkish troops in British pay,' to settle affairs at Suakin. On the 18th he asked for Zubair to be appointed—not to relieve the garrisons, but to act as his successor. His apparent intentions to proceed southwards from Khartoum led Sir E. Baring to telegraph to the Foreign Office: 'I do not think that General Gordon should be allowed, at any rate for the

* Writing from Assouan on February 1, General Gordon stated: 'Altogether my impression is that the revolt in the Sudan, although perhaps serious, was and is only dangerous owing to the utterly effete Egyptian Government. . . . I may be wrong, but I feel confident that you need not feel alarmed either for me, Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart, the Suakin-Berber route, or the Bahr Gazelle and Equatorial Provinces.'

‘present, to go anywhere southwards of Khartoum.’ The proposal, strongly supported by Sir E. Baring, to send Zubair to the Sudan on General Gordon’s departure, was rejected by her Majesty’s Government on the double ground that ‘the gravest objections exist to the appointment, by their authority, of a successor to General Gordon,’ and that ‘the public opinion of this country would not tolerate’ this particular selection. On February 26 General Gordon telegraphed, after receiving news of the refusal of Zubair:—

‘That settles question for me. . . . Of course my duty is evacuation, and the best I can for establishing a quiet government. The first I hope to accomplish. The second is a more difficult task, and concerns Egypt more than me. If Egypt is to be quiet, Mahdi must be smashed up. Mahdi is most unpopular, and with care and time could be smashed. . . . If you decide on smashing Mahdi, then send up another 100,000/, and send up to Dongola under pretence to look out quarters for troops.’

On February 29 he telegraphed:—

‘There is not much chance of improving, and every chance of its getting worse. . . . Should you wish to intervene, send 200 British troops to Wady Halfa, and officers to inspect Dongola, and then open up Suakin-Berber road by Indian Moslem troops. This will cause an immediate collapse of the revolt. Whether you think it worth while to do this or not, you are, of course, the best judge. . . . If you decide against this, you may probably have to decide between Zebehr and the Mahdi.’

On March 2 he further telegraphed:—

‘I have no option about staying at Khartoum; it has passed out of my hands, and as to sending a larger force than 200, I do not think it necessary, to Wady Halfa. It is not the number, but the prestige which I need. I am sure the revolt will collapse if I can say that I have British troops at my back.’

There was no more real difficulty about sending 200 British troops from Cairo to Wady Halfa than to Suez; but Sir E. Baring telegraphed on March 5: ‘I agree with the military authorities in thinking that it would not be desirable to comply with this request.’*

Again General Gordon pleaded for Zubair:—

‘The combination at Khartoum of Zebehr and myself is an absolute necessity for success’ (March 3). ‘The sending of Zebehr means the extrication of the Cairo employé’s at Khartoum and the garrisons for Senaar and Kassala. I can see no possible way to do so except through him.’ (March 8.)

* The troops were sent shortly afterwards.

The difficulties of a general evacuation being now evident, he telegraphs as to the case of Khartoum only:—

‘If the immediate evacuation of Khartoum is determined upon irrespective of outlying towns, I would propose to send down all the Cairo employes and white troops with Colonel Stewart to Berber, where he would await your orders. I would also ask her Majesty’s Government to accept the resignation of my commission, and I would take all steamers and stores up to the Equatorial and Bahr Gazelle Provinces, and consider those provinces as under the King of the Belgians.’ (March 9.)

On March 13, Lord Granville gave General Gordon full discretionary power to ‘evacuate Khartoum and save that garrison by conducting it himself to Berber without delay;’ but trusted that he ‘will not resign his commission.’ By the 24th the full gravity of the situation was at length realised, and Sir E. Baring telegraphed:—

‘The question now is how to get General Gordon and Colonel Stewart away from Khartoum. . . . Under present circumstances I think an effort should be made to help General Gordon from Suakin, if it is at all a possible military operation. . . . We all consider that, however difficult the operations from Suakin may be, they are more practicable than any operations from Korosko and along the Nile.’

On the 9th, a message from Gordon reached Cairo stating:—

‘I wish I could convey to you my impressions of the truly trumpery nature of this revolt, which 500 determined men could put down. Be assured for present and for two months hence we are as safe here as at Cairo. If you could get by good pay 3,000 Turkish infantry and 1,000 Turkish cavalry, the affair, including smashing of Mahdi, would be accomplished in four months.’

Then followed the bitter words received on April 16:—

‘As far as I understand, the situation is this: You state your intention of not sending any relief up here or to Berber, and you refuse me Zebhr. I consider myself free to act according to circumstances. I shall hold on here as long as I can, and if I can suppress the rebellion, I shall do so. If I cannot, I shall retire to the Equator and leave you the indelible disgrace of abandoning the garrisons of Senaar, Kassala, Berber, and Dongola, with the certainty that you will eventually be forced to smash up the Mahdi under great difficulties if you would retain peace in Egypt.’

In a telegram received at Cairo on April 19, General Gordon states: ‘We have provisions for five months and are hemmed in . . . Our position will be much strengthened when the Nile rises . . . Senaar, Kassala, and Dongola are quite safe for the present.’ He then suggested ‘an appeal

'to the millionaires of America and England' to subscribe money for the pay of '2,000 or 3,000 Nizams' to be sent to Berber.

And now a cloud, never to be wholly lifted, settled over Khartoum, its garrison, and their devoted chief. Subsequent communications were irregular, and, latterly, alarming. It is clear that General Gordon was sadly in want of information. On September 9, when the preparations for the relief expedition were being hotly pressed, he wrote to the Khedive, Nubar Pasha, and Sir E. Baring: 'How many times have we written asking for reinforcements, calling your serious attention to the Soudan? . . . Of course you take no interest for suppressing this rebellion.'

The story of the terrible mistake committed in the selection of a route to Khartoum, condemned by everyone who possessed any real qualification for pronouncing an opinion, has been already told in this Journal.* The construction of the fatal whale boats began on August 12, and the embarkation at Sarras of the first troops which used them did not take place till November 6. At least a month before this a perfectly equipped force could have started from Suakin for Berber by the road over which more than 5,000 ill-equipped Egyptians had passed in the previous year. The decision to adopt the Nile route at its period of greatest difficulty can only be accounted for by a wish on the part of the Government to avoid further slaughter at Suakin. This slaughter was merely postponed till all justification for it had passed away.

Looking back on all the facts now that time has lent perspective, the blame which has been unsparingly bestowed upon her Majesty's Government for its 'abandonment' of General Gordon appears to need qualification. The perplexities of the situation were great. So little was Mahdism understood, that there was at first no idea that General Gordon would require a military force for the accomplishment of his task. Zubair was refused; but, up to the end of July 1884, Sir H. Gordon considered that his despatch to Khartoum would involve danger. This view, thus presented, must have weighed heavily with any government. Not till March 24 did the perils of the situation appeal so strongly to Sir E. Baring as to induce him to urge the movement from Suakin which he had previously rejected. Subsequent news, such as General Gordon's avowed intention of going to the

* July 1890.

Equatorial Provinces, appeared to indicate that he was in no personal danger. Finally, late as was the decision to send a relief expedition, there was ample time to reach Khartoum if the wrong route had not been selected. From the first, however, General Gordon had pointed out the necessity of keeping open the Suakin-Berber road—a necessity which a glance at the map renders evident. After General Graham's action in March, there was no difficulty in a task which would have been their only possible justification. The tribes, never really ill-disposed, merely needed support to have been useful allies. General Graham and Colonel Herbert Stewart, who had gained knowledge of the country, urged this course; but their counsels were overridden. For this grave mistake, and for that of permitting Hicks's departure for Kordofan against his judgement, and Baker's expedition to Tokar, the real blame is due.

Major Wingate, in his account of the last days of Khartoum, shows clearly the terrible straits to which General Gordon was reduced. 'The soldiers stood on the fortifications like pieces of wood,' writes Bordeini Bey. 'The civilians were even worse off. Many died of hunger, and corpses filled the streets. . . . The soldiers suffered terribly from want of food; some of them deserted. . . . We all became heartbroken, and concluded that no army was coming to relieve Khartoum.' To a town of some 30,000 people, thus circumstanced, Sir C. Wilson, with twenty British soldiers, dressed in red coats and accompanied by a nugger containing dhurra, was to make his way. He was only to 'stay in Khartoum long enough to confer fully with General Gordon.'* His squad might be marched through the streets, but was not to sleep in the city, and must return at once to Metemmeh. By these means the siege of Khartoum was to be raised, and Berber was pointed out as the then objective of the expedition. Yet many writers appear to regard Sir C. Wilson's mission as that of a relieving force, and Major Wingate seems to share this view. Surely never was the belief in the moral effect of a red-coat strained so far as this; its mere appearance, followed by swift retreat, continued for a hundred miles, was to put to flight 50,000 Arabs, of whom some, at least, were of the stamp of those who fought at Abu Klea!

Some fresh light is thrown on the Mahdi's preparations to meet the movement of the desert column. Abu Safia and

* Orders to Colonel Sir C. Wilson.

Wad Mussa were sent down from Omdurman, and were seen on their way by the crews of General Gordon's steamers on January 9. Another detachment, under Nur Angara, was ordered up from Berber, only arriving in time to fight at Abu Kru on the 19th. Sir H. Stewart first started from Korti on December 30; and it seems probable, therefore, that if, in place of the 'camel corps'—composed of detachments from twenty regiments, cavalry and infantry jumbled together—two infantry battalions had marched straight across the desert, using the camels for transport only,* they would have reached Abu Klea with little opposition. The preliminary movement to Jakdul disclosed the whole plan, and postponed the real departure from Korti till the 8th. The last chance for General Gordon and Khartoum was thus lost. Under the circumstances, this chance was not a bright one; but it is just possible that, if the town had been reached by a portion of the advanced guard on the 14th, before Omdurman had fallen—as was practicable—General Gordon might have been able to raid in provisions and save the situation. By the bitter irony of circumstances, the sole chance of an expedition, whose only justification lay in boat transport, came to depend entirely on camels, and this chance was lost because of the misuse of these camels.

Mr. Russell derives his account of the desperate venture of the desert column from Count Gleichen's book, and thus repeats the mistakes which a young officer, not behind the scenes, naturally makes. For example, the position of the wells of Abu Klea was exactly known, since they are accurately placed on Sir J. Fowler's map. The book throws a strong light, however, upon the wretched equipment with which the desert column was provided.

'Barely twenty per cent. of the skins held their complement of water. . . . At the end of the first day's march you would find half your water evaporated. . . . The long Egyptian leather water bottles (musseks) were even worse, letting the water out in streams through the seams. . . . The sailors (thirty in number) were better off; for they had brought up a quantity of large india-rubber bags, specially made for the purpose.'

The ill-treatment of the miserable camels was probably unexampled. Their saddles did not fit, and covered them with sores. They were half fed. A great portion of them

* That this was perfectly feasible was afterwards proved by the Royal Irish Regiment, which covered a great portion of the distance from Korti to Abu Klea at the rate of twenty miles per day. †

had to march from Korti to Jakdul, back to Korti, and then to the Nile—about 380 miles *—with scarcely a rest. As a result, the force found itself on the Nile with its transport practically destroyed. From such evidence as is available, it appears that, of about 4,000 camels employed with the desert column, only 260 remained serviceable; while, out of a total of about 8,200 bought for the use of a boat expedition, some 6,100 disappeared in six months; and of the remainder many had become non-effective.

Mahdism had thriven during 1884, and the fall of Khar-toum, coupled with the inevitable retirement of the relief force, conferred upon it new powers. On the negroid tribes of the mountains of southern Kordofan, Mohammed Ahmed could make no impression. King Adam and King Mek Kumbo defied him in their strongholds, and refused to give up some of the fugitives of Kashgil. But, in Darfur, the Emir Zogal, after capturing El Fasher and Jebel Marra, established his rule over the province. Here, as in Kordofan, however, the negroes of the mountains were never subdued. The Arab slave raids were not forgotten, and the negro was susceptible of no religious enthusiasm.

‘The two races,’ states Major Wingate, ‘are like vinegar and oil, and the events of past years have shown that, except where coerced by superior cunning or by force of numbers, the sturdy negro has retained to the last his contempt for the Arab.’

In Bahr-el-Ghazal, Lupton Bey, whose troops and sub-governors openly avowed their disaffection, was forced to surrender to the Emir Karamallah, and ‘in this vast province . . . not a shred of Egyptian authority remained.’

In the Eastern Sudan Kassala was closely pressed; but the Beni Amer tribe as yet retained their allegiance, and Colonel Chernside, at Suakin, was making efforts to secure the co-operation of the Abyssinians for the relief of the garrisons on their frontier.

Among the least satisfactory features of Major Wingate’s book are the palpable injustice meted out to the unfortunate King John, and the somewhat contemptuous allusion to a treaty made by a British admiral, and ratified by her Majesty the Queen and the Khedive. Among the schemes for the withdrawal of the helpless garrisons of the Sudan was that of evoking the aid of Abyssinia. In accordance with the second article of the treaty signed by the

* About 130 miles longer than the distance from Suakin to Berber.

King, Admiral Hewett, and Mason Bey, on June 3, 1884, 'the country called Bogos' * was to be ceded to Abyssinia in return for the relief of the garrisons of Kassala, Amedib, and Senhit. Galabat and Gera having been overlooked by some extraordinary inadvertence, a request was subsequently conveyed that they might be considered as included. King John was thus to become the catspaw of the British Government. 'What has Abyssinia to do with this question?' said General Gordon at Khartoum. 'It is like a big boy 'getting a little boy to fight his battles.' Loyally the king prepared to carry out his engagement; and early in October Ras Aloula informed Colonel Chermiside that he had been ordered to proceed to Kassala. On September 21, however, Sir E. Baring had telegraphed, 'It is undesirable that they (the Abyssinians) should make any attempt to do so.' King John was, therefore, directed to counter-order the movement and relieve Galabat instead. This he carried out after much fighting, and the garrisons of Senhit, Amedib, and Gera were also safely withdrawn by his troops after more fighting. These and the people brought away by Mr. Stanley were the only endangered garrisons saved from the wreck of the Egyptian Sudan. After inexplicable delay, the Abyssinians were again invoked, even though Sir E. Baring telegraphed, on July 21, 1885: 'Their aid must be 'considered an uncertain factor.' And again Ras Aloula signified his willingness to undertake the task, and wrote, on August 26, 'to the effect that he would start after the 'feast of St. John (September 13), and that he was collecting cattle for the Kassala garrison.' Leaving Asmara on September 15, the Abyssinians reached Kufit on the 22nd, to fight a murderous battle with about 8,000 Arabs under Osman Digna. In this single action the loss of our allies, fighting in a quarrel which was not their own, was probably about three times the total British loss in battle from the intervention in Egypt in 1882 to the present time. Ras Aloula then returned to Asmara. 'Various reasons,' states Major Wingate, 'are given for his not proceeding to 'Kassala.' The most natural reason would apparently be that his troops, who were not Germans, required time to recover themselves after their heavy losses. The precise reason, however, is of no consequence whatever, as we are told that 'before he fought his battle, Kassala had to all

* Originally belonging to Abyssinia, and formally abandoned by the Egyptian Government under orders from the Foreign Office.

'intents and purposes surrendered.' The later history of the Abyssinian alliance, much of which Major Wingate passes over in silence, and the fate of the unfortunate king, may now be told. The treaty of June 1884, to which the honour of Great Britain was pledged, contained a clause stating that 'there shall be free transit for all goods through Massowah, including arms and ammunition, under British protection.' Whether the previously incurred obligations of this country were ever conveyed to the Italian ambassador when, on December 17, 1884, he was informed that 'Her Majesty's Government had no objection to raise against the Italian occupation of some point on the coast, between and including Beilul and Massowah' cannot be stated; but an imbroglio between Italy and Abyssinia quickly and naturally followed. Not only were the conditions of Admiral Hewett's treaty unfulfilled, but Italian troops advanced to Sahati, which was unquestionably neutral ground. Ras Aloula frankly warned the Italian general that he would be attacked; the latter replied by ordering up reinforcements, and the massacre, falsely so called, at Dogali resulted. King John, who, under the treaty, had in vain appealed to the mediation of England, after the fracas with the Italian troops, wrote a touching letter to her Majesty the Queen on February 30, 1887:—

'I wrote to you last year about the agreement which was broken, but I have not received an answer yet. . . . With hard trouble during a flood, which destroyed very many of my army, I sent a great many soldiers, when the Egyptians were surrounded by the enemy in great fear, and rescued them and sent them home. . . . Now I write to you that you may see if there is anything wrong done by me. What is the thing which I have done wrong? Because the agreement with me is broken. Now then, if it is with your permission that the Italians have come, send me a message; but, if they have come by force, God be with the weaker.'

For some unexplained reason this letter did not reach England until July 1887, and the reply,* written in August, merely requested the king to concede all the demands of the Italians, including the retrocession of Senhit, or Bogos, assigned to him by a British Government, and utterly ignored his inconvenient allusions to the broken treaty. In October 1887, King John addressed another letter to the Queen begging the good offices of Great Britain.

'As your Majesty advises making peace, I will send, if the road is

* Blue Book, Abyssinia, No. 1, 1888.

open, an embassy to you. Let Italy do the same, and your Majesty will arbitrate between us. I have done no wrong.'

The Portal mission followed,—one of the most humiliating ever undertaken by a British official, since its import was simply to persuade the king to tear up a treaty to which he only had been faithful, and to cede territory solemnly made over to him. The relief of the garrisons, at the bidding of England, necessarily involved the Abyssinians with the Mahdi, and in the autumn of 1877 they were completely defeated, with heavy loss, by Abu Angar. The Arabs then advanced to Gondar, and 'sacked the town, destroying 'most of the principal buildings and churches, and capturing 'thousands of women and children.' Further heavy fighting took place in 1888, in which the Abyssinians seem to have been ultimately successful, and King John advanced to Galabat in January 1889, to fall mortally wounded in the hour of victory. 'The Abyssinians had scattered far and 'wide in search of loot; many, thinking the battle was 'over, left the scene of action; while the king's misfortune 'seemed to have paralysed the remainder.' The Arabs rallied and succeeded in capturing the king's body. His head was sent to Khartoum.

Among the causes which contributed to the decline of Mahdism, Major Wingate includes the action taken by the Abyssinians; but officialism has no word of sympathy for King John, or for the many thousands of his followers who fell in carrying out 'what has been called a treaty.' Since the days of Warren Hastings there has been nothing more discreditable to the British name than the treatment meted out to Abyssinia.

Khartoum having fallen, the false position in which the Nile expedition had been placed soon became evident. Even the idea of capturing Berber had to be abandoned; but with a view to operations in the autumn it was determined to commence a railway from Suakin.

Assuming that it was really intended to go to Khartoum, the second expedition, which assembled at Suakin by the middle of March 1885, had a definite object—to open and improve the only practicable line of communication. The policy of crushing the Mahdi at Khartoum was, however, soon abandoned,* and on May 11 a general withdrawal was

* The demand for twelve fresh British battalions and for an extension, of forty-seven miles, to the Wady Halfa railway, would under the circumstances have staggered any government.

ordered. Thus, more lives were sacrificed without any result whatever, and to the tribes of the Eastern Sudan the British proceedings appeared inexplicable. A Norse raid was carried out with a definite object—plunder. The expedition of 1885 arrived suddenly out of the sea, marched into a territory abandoned by proclamation, and, after inflicting heavy losses on the tribesmen, returned to its ships and disappeared.

By the end of the year 1885 the tide of Mahdism had nearly reached the end of its flow. Ginnis, half way between the Second and Third Cataracts, and Suakin were in the keeping of British troops. Lado, the most northerly station of the Equatorial Provinces, was besieged. Between these wide limits not a single Egyptian garrison remained. All, with their wives and children, had been starved, massacred, or reduced to slavery; the sum total of human misery involved baffles imagination. Major Wingate pays a just tribute to the long and dogged resistance offered by some of these forsaken garrisons.

‘Initiative the Egyptian has not. Decision he has not. Placed in a position when he must quickly commit himself on a question of life and death, he, without confidence in himself or his officers, will surely fail; but, placed in a situation where the alternative is remote, he will endure with fortitude.’

And it is certain that at El Obeid, Khartoum, Sinkat,* Kassala, and elsewhere the hapless garrisons endured to the end.

On June 14, 1885, just Nemesis overtook Mohammed Ahmed in the form of a woman of Khartoum, and Abdullah-el-Taashi, a Baggara chief, who had made careful preparations for the event, at once had a suitable vision. Precedent was carefully followed, due military precautions were taken, and Abdullah, assuming the khalifate with little opposition, issued proclamations in which the scale of rewards to the faithful who perished in battle was considerably increased.

The Mahdi, in his waking visions, had contemplated an invasion of Egypt. His khalifa could scarcely abandon the project without loss of prestige, and towards the end of

* Major Wingate curiously includes among instances of stubborn defence Tokar, which came to a premature arrangement with the enemy when relief was at hand, and omits Sinkat, whose garrison, under the brave Tewfik Bey, sallied forth when *in extremis* and died fighting.

November, an 'irregular stream' of Arabs moved northwards. 'Recruiting as they came, the emirs took a man or 'two men per water-wheel.' The frontier force, in all 3,000 strong, of whom about half were British troops, was fully informed, and deliberate preparations were made. In the early morning of December 30 the Arabs were surprised. A single somewhat half-hearted charge of spearmen was made, and then the whole rabble quickly dissolved into a 'dis-organised mass of fugitives.' On the west bank of the Nile, the Arabs made a show of attacking Barrow's zariba, but speedily retreated. The armed steamer 'Lotus' 'inflicted 'considerable loss.' The total Anglo-Egyptian casualties amounted to seven killed and thirty-four wounded. Thus ended the first 'invasion' of Egypt, and for three years and a half the Nile frontier was never really threatened.

Meanwhile, in the autumn of 1885,

'the first signs of the decadence of Mahdism in the Suakin neighbourhood began to appear. . . . Gradually a feeling of dissatisfaction sprang up as tribes began to realise that after all their losses they had gained nothing. . . . Many . . . openly declared they had been deceived.'

Thus, as Major Wingate shows, all the conditions were favourable to the pacification of this portion of the Sudan. Great Britain was virtually in possession of the one considerable port, although the Egyptian flag still flew there. Her Majesty's ships patrolled the Red Sea coasts. The whole of the territory outside the immediate neighbourhood of Suakin had been abandoned by a proclamation issued in accordance with orders from London. Great Britain had no quarrel with the tribes of the Eastern Sudan, to whom it may even be thought that she owed reparation for the slaughter of at least ten thousand of their bravest fighting men. The main interest at Suakin was trade, which was also the interest of the camel-owning Arabs. The obvious policy was, therefore, to facilitate legitimate trade by all possible means, and thus gradually to build up interests extending into the interior which would make for peace. To an eminently commercial nation such a policy would naturally appear to commend itself.

The extraordinary moral and political obliquity which from first to last has marked the proceedings of Great Britain in relation to the Sudan proved, unhappily, persistent. The results of mirage are everywhere apparent in Major Wingate's treatment of this portion of his subject;

and the story, even as set forth in carefully edited blue books, does not appear in his semi-official pages.*

Colonel Chermside, the governor-general of the Red Sea littoral, enunciated his policy as follows:—

‘My policy is to be very reserved in dealing with tribes. If it were a question of reconquest, some conditions should be imposed in cases. As there is no such question, I should show little interest in any but wholesale submissions, and make no concessions as to opening of coast markets except on mature consideration.’

How ‘wholesale submissions’ could be claimed from a population who owed no allegiance whatever, and over whom all intention to assert authority had been publicly disavowed, was not explained. In pursuance of this preposterous policy, a blockade was set up which was wholly unjustifiable, and which, after uselessly exasperating the tribes, resulted in widespread famine. Suakin, as a port whence grain and Manchester goods, urgently needed, could be obtained, was no object of hostility. Suakin, barring the incoming of grain, was a place to be taken if possible. Thus the hopeful situation which Major Wingate describes was quickly clouded, and by the end of 1885 an Anglo-Indian garrison, about 3,500 strong, was practically invested by a greatly inferior force of Osman Digna’s Arabs posted at Tamai, Hasheen, and Handoub.

On February 8, 1886, Colonel Sir Charles Warren arrived at Suakin. Fresh from South Africa, where he had solved a difficult problem without bloodshed; known as wholly indifferent to the inducements to provoke fighting which too frequently influence smaller men; and possessing a varied experience in dealing with semi-civilised peoples, the new governor-general was exactly fitted to his post. An immediate change for the better followed,† and Sir C. Warren was rapidly winning the confidence of the people when, unfortunately for the Sudan, he was recalled to London. His successor, Major Watson, in a memorandum of April 6, 1886, had previously indicated the lines of a rational and humane policy:—

‘If the Government were to declare that the war was at an end, and to reopen trade, it is possible that after a time the country would settle down. . . . Had he (Sir C. Warren) remained, he might have

* Blue Book, Egypt, No. 2, 1886.

† One of Sir C. Warren’s first acts was to sweep away the ridiculous and panic-begotten regulation under which every native entering Suakin had a sack placed over his head.

succeeded in pacifying the country, as he had begun to inspire considerable confidence. The constant change of governors has had a bad effect, and tends to prevent a settlement. It is of the greatest importance now that some one should be sent to Suakin with full powers to deal with the question and to reopen trade with the natives.'

Perhaps unfortunately for himself, Major Watson went on to point out that 'if the policy of reopening trade were 'adopted,' a considerable decrease of the garrison of Suakin could be effected. Towards this end he devoted himself, personally interviewing the local sheikhs, who proceeded to clear out the dervishes from the country north of Suakin, and subsequently to blockade Osman Digna at Tamai. Thus, in a short time, the situation was reversed, and Major Watson was even able to send Brewster Bey to Handoub to confer with the Amarar chiefs. Two ports—Rowayah and Sheikh Barghut—were opened for trade. All the prospects were hopeful.

At this moment Major Watson was recalled without reason assigned, and the inquiry which he at once demanded was refused. Motives frequently baffle analysis; but in this case they can be brought within narrow limits. Either it was considered desirable that a running sore should be maintained at Suakin for obvious political reasons, or a section of the military party at Cairo viewed a practicable reduction of the Egyptian army with disfavour, and regarded Suakin as an available field for its military energies and a possible source of distinctions. No other explanation can be suggested for a change of governors at a time when the whole outlook was peaceful.

Colonel Kitchener succeeded Major Watson on September 7, with instructions which have never been published, and quickly the scene changed. At Tamai, which had been blockaded by the friendly tribes acting under Major Watson's directions, the best result that could have been attained was surrender or the gradual escape of the Arabs who remained after Osman Digna had fled. The end was hastened, however, and on October 7 the fort was assaulted. The power of disposal of the spoil afforded an easy means of making arrangements to prevent the indiscriminate massacre which appears to have occurred. The scene on the following day has been described by eye-witnesses as pitiable.

'The garrison were a great deal too weak to defend themselves, and after the first rush of the attacking tribesmen, which was met with a volley from the defenders, everything was over except the cold-

blooded butchery that ensued. Little or no quarter was given to the men; many women also were killed.*

Her Majesty's Government, however, telegraphed 'warm congratulations' on this 'brilliant success.' So various do matters appear from different points of view. A considerable amount of loot was taken at Tamai, and, as no authoritative distribution was made, nearly the whole was appropriated by a single sheikh in Government employ, who was not present and who contributed only about 100 out of nearly 1,500 tribesmen in the field. The natural result was profound discontent.

Moreover, there seems to be little doubt that some of the prisoners taken in this miserable affair were actually sold. Mr. Wylde states:—

'Some were given away in the town, some sent to Egypt, some to Jeddah to be sold, and the majority of them were shipped from a harbour about eight miles north of Suakin to Jeddah. The tribesmen knew it, and I can only say it had a most deplorable effect. They said, "Here are the English backing up the Egyptian;" their one cry was, "You must not do slave business."'

In a letter of February 17, 1887,† to Sir F. Stephenson, Seyd Mahmoud, an Ashruf sheikh, states:—

'Three hundred slaves were also brought in. Mahmoud Ali Bey and his family took possession of them, and the greater portion of them were shipped off to Jeddah for sale, from the different small harbours.'

Under the circumstances, direct responsibility for the disposal of prisoners and of all spoil taken at Tamai rested with the British governor, who had supreme power, and in whose pay Mahmoud Ali Bey was.

The policy of Major Watson had been to induce the tribesmen to turn out the Mahdiist intruders from their own territory. This policy was now enlarged with the worst results. They were ordered to attack Tokar, where they had no business to be, and at the same time a peremptory summons was sent to the sheikhs of the Delta to surrender to the Government. No reservation of the Tokar district had been made in the proclaimed abandonment of the Sudan. By what conceivable right were these people called upon to surrender? The result was as expected by everyone who knew the country and the people. The friendly tribes

* '1883 to 1887 in the Soudan.' A. B. Wylde.

† Now published for the first time, by Mr. Russell.

refused to fight in what was to them foreign territory. The Tokar chiefs refused to send in their submission, and the governor, who had prematurely proceeded to Trinkitat to receive it, was compelled to return with inevitable loss of prestige. The whole proceedings destroyed confidence, and gave rise to natural ill-will and suspicion. By the end of November 1887 Suakin was again insulted and threatened, and on December 16 Commander Rooke telegraphed to the Admiralty: 'Enemy is collecting in force at Hasheen, Handoub, Tamai. Skirmishes near forts to-day. Continued attack most likely.' The ubiquitous Osman Digna reappeared. 'His patrols were most active by day,' writes Major Wingate, 'while the gardens under the walls were pillaged by night, and once more Suakin was in a state of siege.'

The curious vicissitudes of what has been called the 'trade policy' can be followed in the blue-book extracts given by Mr. Russell; but it is impossible to say where lay the evil influence by which that policy was persistently thwarted. On March 30, 1886, an extensively signed petition of the merchants of Cairo was addressed to Sir H. Drummond Wolff in favour of opening trade with the Sudan.

'The stopping of trade with the Sudan may be considered one of the very important factors in the existing chronic stagnation of business in Egypt. We therefore beg to call the attention of your Excellency to the desirability of reopening this outlet to trade in merchandise as soon as possible.'

On April 13, 1886, Sir H. Drummond Wolff telegraphed:

'Generals say that while desirous that negotiations should be opened with the Sudan, they do not think the present a favourable moment; but that one of the objects desired by the insurgents (*sic*) in asking for peace is removal of blockade.'

On May 21 General Stephenson telegraphed to the Secretary of State for War:—'At meeting yesterday, Nubar, Wolff, Baring, and self present, agreed to reopen trade with Sudan.' On the 24th Sir H. Drummond Wolff wrote:—

'It was considered by all of us that the opening of trade . . . would have a pacific tendency. . . . I believe the opening out of trade would at this moment prove of great advantage in the solution of the Sudan problem. It would probably divert the mind of the Sudanese from warlike enterprise.'

On June 7 the War Office intervened, apparently in opposition to the views of General Stephenson—

‘In the opinion of the military authorities, in which Mr. Campbell Bannerman concurs, it would be very unwise to open the trade as proposed.’

Sir H. Drummond Wolff, however, adhered to his views, and telegraphed on June 8—

‘It is of the greatest importance that we should be given discretionary power to open trade with the Sudan, or promise that it shall be opened in possibly impending negotiations. General Stephenson concurs in this opinion.’

General Butler, in a remarkable memorandum of July 2, powerfully supported the ‘trade policy’ :—

‘Debarred from trade these people suffer severely; and since they will attribute their sufferings to us, they will naturally welcome dervish invaders as their deliverers. . . . Our patrols, searchings, and seizures must tend to the exasperation of the people against us. . . . I believe that a dervish invading army could find its strongest support, not in a prosperous and contented community, but in one whose feelings had been exasperated against us, and who had come to regard any change as desirable. . . . I think that the Sudan population ascribe to us the ill effects from which they are suffering . . . and I think that this impression has been very widely increased by the knowledge, now more or less general, that it is the English and not the Egyptian Government who are opposed to the opening of trade.’

Sir H. Drummond Wolff and General Stephenson strongly supported General Butler’s masterly arguments, and the former telegraphed that Moukhtar, Nubar, and Abd-el-Kader Pashas ‘are in favour of the removal of the blockade.’

On August 8 Sir H. Drummond Wolff reported an interesting interview with Sheikh Ibrahim-el-Senussi, the cousin of the rival Mahdi.

‘He advocated the opening of the trade which he said would content three-fourths of the population, who, in the absence of facilities for commerce, were thrown into the hands of the dervishes. If the Sudanese could not trade, they must fight.’

Meanwhile the War Office took the extraordinary step of ignoring their experienced officers on the spot and sending out a special emissary, who two days after his arrival telegraphed that he had mastered the whole subject, and that ‘there are strong reasons for reopening trade with the ‘Sudan, stronger than I thought before I was on the spot.’ In less than three weeks he had returned to the War Office, where he wrote a report which states :—

‘I will only add that one result of my visit to Egypt has been to lead me to the conclusion that the question of permitting or preventing

trade with the Sudan has not the importance, one way or the other, that is attributed to it.'

This report, which Mr. Russell leniently stigmatises as a 'meagre and flaccid document,' appears to have effectually obstructed the wise and humane policy for which General Butler eloquently contended. Sir H. Drummond Wolff, however, persisted in urging his views, and stated that Mouklitar Pasha, the representative of the Porte, 'spoke in terms of some annoyance at the refusal of her Majesty's Government to open trade,' and that General Stephenson considered that 'as soon as peace is restored to the Eastern Sudan, we are bound in honour to open the trade at Suakin.' To this, soon after the fall of Tamai, her Majesty's Government gave a conditional assent.

The favourable moment had then passed, and the *régime* which existed at Suakin seems to have been directly opposed to conciliation. Trade was partially opened under restrictions which at once drew a strong protest from the British Consul and the London Chamber of Commerce. In spite of protestations of the general willingness to adopt the conciliatory policy which had proved eminently successful in the hands of Sir C. Warren and Major Watson, the actual proceedings in the Eastern Sudan were of a distinctly irritating nature. Injudicious intertribal raids were permitted and encouraged, which led to retaliation, and eventually drew a rebuke from Sir E. Baring, endorsed by Lord Salisbury. An ill-executed movement on Handoub was repulsed. Meanwhile a narrow militarism showed itself in the effort to prevent news of Suakin affairs from reaching this country, and in the refusal to allow Mr. Wylde to land, solely because he had from the first advocated a policy of sense and humanity, which had gained for him the well-deserved confidence of the Sudanese. The appointment of sheikhs by the governor-general—an act of interference which appears unjustifiable—irritated the tribes. Under such conditions the situation steadily grew worse. Suakin was closely besieged; an addition was made to the Egyptian army, and early in December, 4,750 men were concentrated for attack. 'With this force General Grenfell reported that he 'was confident of success.' The fighting took place on the morning of December 20, and the steam-hammer could scarcely fail to crack its nut. The trenches, held by about 1,000 Arabs, under a heavy fire from the forts of Suakin and from H.M. ships, were easily turned by the troops, with a loss of only 6 killed and 46 wounded.

The year 1888 brought difficulties to the Khalifa in Darfur, where Sheikh Abu Gemaizieh of the Masalit tribe, became the leader of a rival religious movement. The aid of the Senussi chief was evoked, and rumours soon spread throughout the Sudan that he had joined the anti-Mahdiist revolt, and that liberation from the Khalifa's tyranny was at hand. The Senussi declined Abu Gemaizieh's overtures as flatly as he had previously rejected those of the Mahdi, and the movement achieved only local success at the cost of much blood.

In Equatoria, Stanley had reached Emin Pasha on April 29, and had returned to bring up his rear-guard. His unfortunate conflict with the Mazamboni, subjects of Kabarega, had considerably increased Emin's many difficulties. The troops had mutinied, and made Emin and Jephson prisoners. Omar Saleh, with a Mahdiist force, had captured Fabbo, but was repulsed at Duffileh. By the end of December, 'the deposed governor, with a few Egyptian troops and their families, in a sorry plight,' was at Tunguru, anxiously awaiting Stanley's return.

From the Nile frontier of Egypt the British troops had been withdrawn, and the Arabs held Surras. Raids occurred, leading to unimportant fighting, but serving as useful training to the young Egyptian army. News of preparations for a second invasion were, however, persistent; and in June 1889, Nejumi, one of the most fanatical adherents of the late Mahdi, was preparing for the attempt. All his movements were known. His motley force, which soon dwindled to 3,300 fighting men, with 4,000 followers, women, and children, left Matuka on July 1, making a long *détour* into the desert. All preparations had been made; four steamers commanded the river. Suffering terribly from privation, the hapless Arabs swept northwards, strewing the ground with their dead, and abandoning quantities of arms, drums, 'saddles, tents,' and two guns. The 'poor and weakly crowd, dying of hunger and thirst,' as it was well described in the letter humanely written by General Grenfell to Nejumi, with a view to avoid a conflict, camped on the hills near Toski on August 1. Only the fanaticism of Nejumi prevailed to prevent surrender, and when the mounted troops of the attacking force came in sight in the early morning of the 3rd, he is reported to have said, 'We must all stand prepared to meet our Maker to-day.' The rout was complete. Over 1,200 Arabs were killed; Nejumi and his little son were found dead by the side of a camel; more than 4,000 prisoners and

deserters were taken. The Egyptian loss was 25 killed and 140 wounded. Thus ended the second invasion of Egypt, which reached a point more than 700 miles from Cairo. It is impossible not to feel pity for the victims, impelled to their doom by a brave fanatic hopelessly ignorant alike of geography and of the far superior power which stood directly in his path. Reports of the advance of large forces from the South have become periodic, but the easy victory won at Toski by a force mainly Egyptian should serve to allay all uneasiness on this account. To an Arab invasion, the 'perpendicular frontier' of Egypt, consisting of hundreds of miles of river commanded by armed steamers, is a tremendous obstacle. No braver or more capable leader than Wad-en-Nejumi is likely to arise; ammunition is now running short in the Sudan; the difficulties of the desert remain.

The year 1889 was uneventful in the Eastern Sudan, where widespread destitution was impending. Mahdism was principally represented by Baggara and Jaalin intruders, whose exactions created profound discontent among the local tribes. 'Anti-Mahdist leagues had not been successful,' mainly because they were ill directed by the authorities at Suakin, who appear never to have attained any grasp of tribal politics, or realised that all the bravest fighting men of the district had fallen before British bullets. Thus a small combined force of Hadendawas and Anagarars, having received a temporary repulse at Sinkat, 'Government refused further assistance, and the league, deprived of support in arms and food, soon broke up and was disbanded.'

In Darfur, the forces of Abu Gemaizieh were defeated with great loss by Osman Adam on February 22. Their leader was killed, and his revolt collapsed. Stanley reached the Albert Nyanza for the third time on January 18, and Emin joined him on February 17. On April 10 the relief force, with some 600 men, women, and children—the remnant of Egyptian rule in Equatoria—'in all some 1,500 'souls,' started from Kavalli on their long and adventurous march to Zanzibar, which was reached on December 6. The subsequent fate of Emin's province is unknown; but, as Major Wingate surmises, it is more than probable that Mahdism never attained any real grip over this great territory, and that the sturdy Dinkas and Shilluks, who have supplied the best material of the Egyptian army, tenaciously hold their own.

Early in 1890 it became known in this country that the people of the Red Sea littoral were suffering from famine.

On February 24, Lord Salisbury telegraphed to Sir E. Baring for information: 'Ascertain the exact state of the case, and let me know whether anything is being done to relieve the sufferers.' No official notice had previously been taken of the matter, and the consul at Suakin writes: 'It was only when the inquiry from Lord Salisbury was made known to the authorities that the question was taken up seriously.' Private charity from England had, however, been already brought to bear, and Dr. Harpur and General Haig laboured to save the helpless people. Their reports and those of Consul Barnham disclose an appalling amount of suffering, to which Major Wingate barely alludes. A year previously Commander May, R.N., had pleaded against the injustice of capturing dhows laden only

'with grain and dates, which the people were much in need of. . . . I am of opinion that, entirely with reference to the Halaib dhow, it would be wiser in the present state of affairs to exercise a little clemency, especially when it is considered that Halaib was closed from no fault of the people, but only because a garrison could not be spared.'

The depletion of the grain stores of the whole country side was a natural result of the restrictive policy, widely disavowed,* but nevertheless long maintained. Thousands of the wretched people died, and, under the circumstances, no assumed military expediency can justify the policy to which they were sacrificed. Osman Digna and his dervishes were the last to feel the pinch,† and the greatest suffering fell upon the Hadendowa tribes, who, properly handled, would have proved staunch allies.‡

The history of the proceedings on the Red Sea littoral abounds in surprises and anomalies of which the end is not yet reached. Apparently with a view to reassure the Arabs of the district, whose suspicions as to the ulterior motives of the governor-general had been naturally aroused, a fresh proclamation was issued, early in 1889, to the 'Hamdab,

* 'My own opinion at one time,' writes Sir E. Baring to Lord Salisbury on January 15, 1889, 'was that the policy adopted by Colonel Kitchener was unduly restrictive.'

† 'These latter (the Baggara intruders) were harrying the country,' states Major Wingate, 'appropriating all the supplies to themselves, and want, almost amounting to famine, was prevailing throughout the country.'

‡ 'About twenty Hadendowa sheikhs from neighbourhood of Sinkat now here tendering submission.'—General Stephenson to Secretary of State for War. December 18, 1886.

‘Hadendowa, Amara, Gemilab, and other tribes.’ Its terms were unexceptionable, and were welcomed by all who preserved an interest in the Sudanese.

‘I write you again so as to let you and all the tribes know clearly what the Government intends to do. As you have often been told during the last few years, the Government does not wish to interfere with the freedom of the tribes or to impose any taxes upon you; all that we wish is that you should live at peace among yourselves, that trade should revive. . . . We intend to keep Suakin, and for this we will spare no trouble or expense. . . . If you will come in to Suakin and see us, we will assist you either with money or food.’

This admirable document was approved by her Majesty’s Government, yet at this very period Commander May was vainly pleading for ‘a little clemency.’ A few months later, because the Hadendowas had not at once succeeded in expelling the dervishes, the governor-general was instructed ‘to give no more assistance in the way of food and arms to ‘the tribes . . . without authority from Cairo.’ This impatience of results exactly illustrates the utter ignorance of the conditions of Sudanese life and ways which characterises the proceedings taken at Suakin.

A hankering after the fertile district of Tokar had been evident ever since the fiasco of November 1886. Here Osman Digna and his dervishes had latterly taken up their quarters, and, so far, the tribesmen, weakened by slaughter and famine, had been unable to dislodge them. To turn out the intruders and re-establish the tribal landowners would evidently have an excellent effect in the direction of restoring confidence. Osman Digna was believed to have departed for the Habab country ‘on a tax-collecting expedition’ of six weeks. Handoub was easily cleared out by two Sudanese battalions, the Arabs making no resistance; and on January 16, 1891, a force of about 1,700 men, almost all Sudanese troops, left Trinkitat for Tokar, whither also Mr. Wylde led 500 tribesmen across country. Osman Digna, forewarned, had returned with his followers, and a well-fought little action took place on the 19th. The dervishes were routed* with a loss of more than 700, the Egyptian casualties being 10 killed and 48 wounded. So far, the action taken appears to be perfectly justifiable. The intruders had been turned out, and a small garrison could be maintained at Tokar until the tribes of the delta

* Of Osman Digna’s very mixed force a considerable portion was disaffected to his cause.

were strong enough to hold their own. Thus the terms of the proclamation approved by her Majesty's Government would have been fulfilled, and the tranquillity of the country promoted.

'It is estimated,' states Major Wingate, 'that the cultivable area of the Tokar delta cannot be less than 300,000 acres, and that of an unusually rich and fertile soil.' 'The acquisition of the Tokar district by the Egyptian Government must prove one of the severest blows ever dealt to the cause of Mahdism,' &c. This whole territory had been abandoned by the Egyptian Government in proclamations of which the last was barely two years old. Land which has been held by the families of Arab chiefs for centuries, land of which ownership was never claimed in the worst days of Egyptian oppression, has now been annexed. Its rightful masters have been dispossessed, and their lands are being redistributed in lots of five acres to applicants who comply with due forms and are prepared to pay what is virtually rent. Such proceedings seem scarcely consonant with modern views of elementary justice, even when the sufferers are merely Arabs whose kinsfolk have been slaughtered and starved by British impolicy. Nothing could be better calculated to justify suspicion than this latest act of the protégé of England, rendered possible only by the aid of British officers. For four years the tribesmen had been urged, in all apparent disinterestedness, to release Tokar from Mahdism. This release has been easily accomplished, and the motive now stands disclosed.

Whether this is the first step in that policy of reoccupation which Major Wingate undisguisedly favours, and which apparently receives the sanction of his superiors, cannot be stated. Whether her Majesty's Government will sanction the proceedings taken at Tokar, when they are in full possession of the facts, is at least doubtful.

'Should that country (the Sudan) again become an integral portion of the Khedivial dominions, there is no doubt that the lessons learnt during the last ten years will not be forgotten. That a new and better Sudan will be raised up over the ashes of Gordon, and all those brave officers and men who have perished in the loyal performance of their duty, is the present hope of every well-wisher for the prosperity of Egypt.'

Thus Major Wingate ends his book ; thus, apparently, the aspirations of the British officers of the Egyptian army shape themselves. This latest manifestation of mirage cannot be too soon dispelled. Unaided, Egypt cannot reoccupy the

Sudan; unwatched, she is wholly unfit to govern it, whatever 'lessons' may have been learnt. At a time when British tutelage of Egypt involves growing difficulties in foreign politics, and even threatens to become a party question, it is certain that Great Britain will lend no ear to the military dreamers of Cairo. The Sudan can be reoccupied by Egypt only by the expenditure of British blood and treasure, and could then be preserved from a recurrence of the iniquities of the past only by British agents. 'One thing 'is certain,' wrote General Gordon, 'that the Egyptians 'should never be allowed out of their own country.' Great Britain will not accept a task which involves the annexation of Egypt as its first preliminary. We do not suppose that Sir E. Baring, who has never deviated from the original policy of abandonment, which he strongly urged upon her Majesty's Government, can sympathise with the ambitions of the officers of the Egyptian army. It is doubtful whether he can have approved the recent proceedings at Suakin. For, although famine and the bullet have thinned the ranks of the tribesmen of the Eastern Soudan, Major Wingate assures us that Mahdism is not yet dead, and that trouble will eventually arise if this arbitrary action is not annulled is certain. The invasions of the Nile Valley with which we are persistently threatened may not improbably be diverted to Tokar. And, under the circumstances above described, strong sympathy might be asserted in this country for Arabs fighting to regain territory accorded to them by formal proclamations, or seeking to throw off taxes against the imposition of which they have been guaranteed.

As a history of the Sudan during its most disastrous years, Major Wingate's work leaves much to be desired. It shows a want of grasp and of power to realise the wrongs of the Sudanese and the Abyssinians. It touches the fringe of great questions, and leaves them unilluminated. Its treatment of military operations, especially those involved in the fiasco of the Nile expedition, is unnecessarily confused. The solution of the Sudan problem which it appears to advocate is wholly impracticable, and proves that official opinion at Cairo is out of touch alike with public sentiment in this country and with European politics.

Of Mahdism, however, viewed as a religious movement, Major Wingate gives a vivid picture. The strange mixture of imposture on the one hand, and real fanaticism on the other; elaborate deception brought to bear upon rankest superstition; aims, ostensibly lofty, sunk to the level of the

lowest tyranny; glimpses of the moral code of the New Testament smothered in a parody of government worthy of Nero—all are ably portrayed. Mohammed Ahmed would have been a notable man in any age or country. His motives must remain as indeterminate as those of the Prophet whose representative he claimed to be. Whether he conceived the idea of liberating the Sudan from intolerable oppression, and assumed the rôle of Mahdi to further this patriotic end, or whether he saw in the bitter sense of wrong around him an available means of gratifying mere personal ambition, cannot be known. In the Baggara slave-dealers he sought and found the military element necessary for his purpose; into their hands the real power seems to have passed even before his death.

The capture at Toski, in 1889, of a manuscript book containing the decrees of the Mahdi and the Khalifa Abdullah throws a curious light on the religious revival. The proceedings of the faithful were carefully regulated. Modesty in dress, 'rules to be observed in riding,' warnings to doubters, 'instructions as to writing,' war, form the principal subjects of the Mahdi's spiritual exhortations, couched in a language strangely compounded of those of the Hebrew prophets, the Koran, and the Puritan divines.

'On meeting the enemy say, "O God, Thee do we worship, and of Thee we beg assistance." We confess that Thou art one, and we attribute no participation to Thee. These are Thine enemies; they believe not in Thee, nor in Thy holy books. . . . O God, overcome them and put terror into their hearts! Grant us, O Lord, Thy Spirit, save us from punishment, and make us victorious! Thou sayest in Thy precious book, Trust ye all in God, He is your Lord, He is an almighty helper."

Meekness and extreme humility were enjoined as in most religions:—

'When you walk, walk quietly and humbly; be not proud nor haughty. . . . Devote yourself to God, and abstain from worldly pleasures and amusements. . . . Prepare always for your own salvation, repent and ask God's forgiveness for having ever indulged in the trifles and enjoyments of this world. Do not crave after those things which were enjoyed by the Cæsars, the Pharaohs, and Akasireh; but pray rather after those things which the prophets and apostles have longed for—poverty and lowliness.'

Yet, like most religions which have achieved temporal power, practice differed absolutely from preaching, and Major Wingate not unjustly states: 'The whole may be 'summed up in the phrase, "Your money or your life!"'

It was a reign of terror which was established at Khartoum in 1885.

The Mahdi and his emirs were voluminous writers, and Major Wingate's book is somewhat overloaded with their compositions, the omission of a single one of which would have allowed space for the names of the more prominent Egyptian officers, unrecorded, as Major-General Grenfell explains, 'for the sake of brevity.' The reports on military operations addressed to the Mahdi are, for the most part, mere specimens of fearless mendacity, tending to throw involuntary doubt upon some of the sources of information on which this history of the achievements of Mahdism is based. The author has, however, bestowed evident care upon his task, and his account of the obscure events which have occurred in these dark regions is probably as close an approximation to fact as will ever be attainable.

Mahdism possesses none of the elements of permanence. Its strength lay in the appeal to the Sudanese to throw off unbearable oppression, in the application of religious enthusiasm to meet a great national need. It quickly degenerated into the tyranny of one section of the Sudanese over the rest. Already, as Major Wingate shows, it is a waning influence, and 'has in a large measure lost the fanatic ardour which made it so formidable.' It is not, and never can be, consolidated. Nothing except an attempted Egyptian reconquest can well provide it with a fresh impulse. Major Wingate rightly claims for it 'sufficient importance 'to necessitate due precautions being taken to check its 'northward progress;' but such precautions can safely be entrusted to the Egyptian army, so long as the present efficiency of the black battalions is maintained.

While Major Wingate has nothing to offer to the Sudan except good wishes and Egyptian reoccupation, Mr. Russell, who has experience of the people, pleads strongly for the trade policy which was so unwisely abandoned. As pointed out by Lieut.-Colonel Stewart in his admirable reports:—

'All the districts south of Khartoum, between the Niles, and also about Karkotsch and Ghedariff, are celebrated for their corn-growing capacity, and may be said to be the granary of the Sudan. Were easy communication opened with the sea, there can be little doubt that a considerable export trade in grain would spring up. At present grain is allowed to rot in the ground in these districts, while it is at famine price at Suakin and Jeddah.'

The products of the great Nile basin are rich and various. Its large population requires the manufactures of Manchester

and Sheffield. 'Bahr-el-Ghazal and Sandeh,' wrote Gessi Pasha in 1879, 'are destined to become great commercial 'markets.' In the trade policy which till recently has been unaccountably thwarted lies the only solution of the problem of the Sudan, and the one real prospect of destroying the slave trade. With true prescience Colonel Stewart wrote:—

'When all, however, is done that can be done, I look with more hone on the opening up of the country, and on the extension of legitimate trade, to bring slavery to an end, than on the most stringent treaties that can be devised, and I am convinced that no instrument will be more effective in bringing about this result than a railway bringing Khartoum within easy distance of the sea.'

Ten years ago the Sudan was safer than many parts of London. Travellers passed through to Khartoum; sportsmen wandered on the Red Sea littoral. The kindness of the people was proverbial; Englishmen, in particular, they liked and respected. Even after the slaughter of 1884 and 1885, Mr. Wylde went alone among the tribesmen, visiting the little-known Erba Mountains, and meeting everywhere with kindness and hospitality till he returned to Suakin, where the sentries threatened to shoot him.

During these ten years the country has been deluged with blood—the result of Mahdism which drew its strength from Egyptian oppression. Said Pasha, General Gordon, and Colonel Stewart all testified to the misery of the people. Warnings were not wanting. Yet the revolt seems to have been regarded as a surprise, almost as if it were something new in the history of nations. Arabi to the Egyptians, as Mohammed Ahmed to the Sudanese, represented the promise of freedom from the yoke of the foreigner. Great Britain at once found herself face to face with responsibilities inevitably following her own deliberate action—responsibilities unrealised and disavowed till it was too late to retrieve disaster. The abandonment of the Sudan by Egypt was absolutely necessary; its public announcement was an act of gross impolicy.

So soon as confidence is restored by free communications with the interior of the country both by land and sea, the Eastern Sudan will be easily tranquillised. British capital will be available to open the basin of the Nile to trade possibilities unapproached by those which have sufficed to create the East Africa Company. Thus alone can the ruin of the Sudan be retrieved; thus only can Great Britain make some reparation for blunders which have brought discredit on her name.

- ART. X.—1. *Speech of the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., at Plymouth.* August 10, 1891.
2. *Speech of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., at Newcastle.* October 2, 1891.
3. *Speeches of the Duke of Argyll and Lord Hartington at Manchester.* November 10, 1891.

THE Unionist Parliament has lived its life. It has almost completed its work. In a few short months it will have passed away full of years and of honour into the region of history; and history will record that of the round dozen of Parliaments which Queen Victoria during her long reign has summoned to Westminster, there is not one which has better claims to the respect and gratitude of the British people. Rarely has it been given to a Parliament to accomplish so thoroughly the work which it was the wish of the majority of the nation that it should perform. When Lord Salisbury, as leader of the Conservative party, and Lord Hartington, followed by a small group of Liberal members of Parliament, appeared side by side at the great meeting at Her Majesty's Opera House in the spring of 1886, an alliance was begun between Conservatives and Liberals which every year that has passed has served still further to consolidate and to weld. Lord Hartington represented a mass of Liberal opinion (how large was seen afterwards) spreading through every class of the community. When the division on the second reading of the Home Rule Bill was taken, it was found that nearly one hundred Liberal members remained true to the principles hitherto professed by all Liberal statesmen, and followed Lord Hartington into the lobby against it. When six weeks later the dissolution came, the country, by a singularly emphatic decision, ratified and approved the action of Parliament. Since then six years have passed away, Liberal Unionists are now numbered by hundreds of thousands; they have to be reckoned with in every constituency of the United Kingdom, and they represent a political force far larger than the mere number of Liberal Unionist members of Parliament may lead careless observers to suppose. Mr. Gladstone, in 1886, gained, as he intended, the Irish vote, which in 1885 had been cast against him. In some parts of Great Britain this vote is an extremely heavy one, and this vote he retains. Were it not that a gigantic transfer of Liberal votes had taken place simultaneously to the opposite side, Home Rule candidates would

in many districts have swept the board. In the country, just as surely as in the House of Commons, the Unionist Government and the Unionist cause have been throughout entirely dependent upon the maintenance of the Unionist alliance.

During the existence of the present Parliament it has been established beyond all controversy that 'the game of law and order is' not 'up in Ireland,' that the Parliament of the United Kingdom can and will pass measures, if necessary, of the most radical character, for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the Irish people, provided only that those measures have been carefully considered and seem likely to secure the results aimed at; that the Government of Lord Salisbury, and the Unionist party as a whole, can and will carry out domestic reforms both in Great Britain and Ireland of at least as thoroughgoing a character as any that have ever been passed by Liberal Governments in the past; and that parliamentary obstruction, even when countenanced by the front Opposition bench, can be defeated by the exercise of firmness and vigour on the part of those who lead the majority of the House of Commons. *

In 1886 the policy of Home Rule was admittedly very largely a policy of despair. It had become impossible, it was said, any longer to govern the United Kingdom as a united kingdom. The burden of responsibility of maintaining law and order and justice and peace in Ireland was too heavy to be borne. Let, therefore, the burden be cast off. The argument from despair—an unworthy argument for British statesmanship to employ—has been finally annihilated by the success of the Unionist Parliament.

Whilst the legislation of the Government has been thorough and far-reaching, in administration they have been equally fortunate. In three great departments of national affairs they have achieved brilliant success. It is not easy to place a limit to the bounds of party prejudice, but we doubt whether many Gladstonians would deny that in the department of Foreign Affairs Lord Salisbury is as able as, and more successful than, was the late Lord Granville; that Mr. Balfour has been, as Irish Secretary, at least the equal of Mr. John Morley; and that Mr. Goschen, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, is no whit inferior to Sir William Vernon Harcourt. To have maintained the Union, to have restored law and order and social liberty in Ireland, to have legislated with thoroughness and prudence, and to have administered with conspicuous success, constitute claims of

the Unionist party upon the confidence of the country which it is perfectly certain the country will ultimately recognise.

We have on previous occasions discussed at sufficient length the more memorable achievements of the Unionist Parliament and the chief political incidents of its career. We wish now to turn our thoughts towards the future. With the expiration of the present Parliament the country will reach a crisis in its history. The General Election will turn upon a question of greater fundamental importance to our whole system of government than has been raised in this kingdom since 1688. Its magnitude is concealed by the advocates of the change resolutely refusing to contemplate it in any of its bearings, by the leader of the Opposition deliberately suppressing all independent inquiry amongst his followers as to its nature, and by the studious employment of a phrase which unites for the time in its favour men whose private interpretations of it are absolutely irreconcilable.

Before, however, a General Election is reached, we are to have one more session of a Parliament whose legal limit does not expire till August 1893. Next month, therefore, Parliament will enter upon its last session, and the last session of a dying Parliament does not generally add much lustre to its reputation. At such periods the nation is naturally much more concerned in speculating upon the character of its coming sovereign than in watching the last hours of the one who still wears the crown. 'Authority forgets a dying king.' The House of Commons, as a whole, always keenly sensitive to public opinion, is fully conscious of its own loss of power, whilst the thoughts of individual members become almost wholly absorbed by the consideration of the relations of themselves with the electors before whom they have so soon to appear as candidates. Thus the great arena of national debate is apt to become little better than the platform of the party candidate; all reality is withdrawn from parliamentary discussion; business of a practical kind is neglected; whilst the uncertainty of the future and the hopes and fears of men combine to dispel for the time public confidence in the permanence of any portion of our national policy. Our relations with the great Powers of Europe, our position in Egypt, our policy towards Ireland—nay, as matters stand at present, the fundamental principles upon which for centuries the English people have been governed, must be regarded as provisional only. Since we have no fixed or written constitution to limit the authority of Par-

liament, the legal power of Parliament is subject to no restrictions whatever. Parliament is supreme over the constitution. No one questions the absoluteness of its power over the property, the liberties, the lives of Englishmen. As the House of Commons more and more absorbs the powers of the other branches of the Legislature, a General Election comes to resemble more and more the choice of a dictator by the people. What next Parliament will do no human being can foresee. It is only certain that it will, like an absolute monarch, have the power to do what it pleases. No wonder that a General Election in the United Kingdom is a time of anxiety to all lovers of their country. Nowhere else is the whole power of the State, the whole destiny of the State, so completely in the hands of the democracy as with us at the time when one Parliament has been dissolved and the people are called upon to elect a new one.

Though, as has been said, the last session of a Parliament is not generally the most edifying of its career, there is much in the peculiar circumstances of the time to make the last session of the Parliament of 1886 a very interesting one. After all, it is not merely through the instrumentality of a dissolution that changes amounting to a partial transformation take place in the personal composition of the House of Commons. About 140 members have been elected since the last General Election. Manifold also, and more important still, are the changes that the lapse of time brings about in the position and weight of our foremost statesmen, and in their relation to each other, to the House of Commons, and to the country. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Goschen have become new forces in politics since 1886. Mr. Balfour, as the Parliamentary leader, and Mr. Goschen as the brilliant Chancellor of the Exchequer of a Conservative Ministry, form a combination which places Conservatism in a totally new light before the British public. No party can flourish—no party can retain popular support, unless its principles and destinies are associated in the popular mind with conspicuous personalities. For some time past the Conservatives have been without a leader in the House of Commons who has had it in him to strike the public imagination and at the same time to enlist its confidence. The fate of the two parties since Mr. Disraeli left the House of Commons has been in this respect in marked contrast. The Liberal party seemed to be in danger of losing itself altogether in the personality of Mr. Gladstone—of substituting mere personal

allegiance to him for a belief in the old principles and traditions which were the true claims of Liberals to public support and favour, whilst on the other side of the House there was not a single statesman whose championship was capable of rousing the warmth of his followers in the country, or even on his own back benches. In the Parliament, for instance, of 1880, there sat upon the front Opposition bench statesmen of acknowledged reputation, of the highest respectability, moved undoubtedly by a strong sense of public duty, yet not one of them possessed the kind of qualities which give to men power over others in such an assembly as the House of Commons. To be a successful party leader in that assembly eloquence is not essential—witness Lord Althorp; yet assuredly such a leader must possess some quality of ability, character, resoluteness of purpose, or what not, which men instinctively feel places him apart from and above the crowd. From the date of Mr. Disraeli's peerage to the fateful year 1886, Mr. Gladstone's ascendancy literally overwhelmed all opposition. The Conservative leaders seemed themselves to recognise their own inferiority. In experience, in eloquence, in fervour, in the power to grasp detail in the most complex matters, in finance, he had no rival; and those who came nearest him in power were his colleagues. How great the change from 1880 to 1892! The tables have indeed been turned. Mr. Gladstone is himself, except on rare occasions, absent from the House of Commons, and the practical daily work of the leadership of his party has devolved on others; whilst almost the whole experience, statesmanship, and debating power of that assembly are opposed to him.

The last few months have made great changes in the leadership of political parties. It is true that the venerable leader of English Home Rulers is still able to command the devoted allegiance of his followers, though he is no longer expected to perform the everyday duties of an Opposition leader in the House of Commons. In the House of Lords, the little band of ex-official Peers who form the Gladstonian party has lost the genial guidance of their experienced chief, Lord Granville. In the House of Commons the change has been far greater. The Liberal Unionist, the Conservative, the Irish Nationalist party, have each to deplore the loss of its leader. The death of the Duke of Devonshire, and the consequent removal of Lord Hartington to the House of Lords, is much more than a blow to the Liberal Unionist party. More than any other man has Lord Hartington, in

the character of his statesmanship, represented the prevailing political spirit which has actuated the Parliament of 1886; and if we looked rather to facts than to the official arrangements necessitated by the curious circumstances of the time, we should see in Lord Hartington the true leader of the House of Commons throughout the eventful years which have followed the last General Election. Had his career in that House been prolonged, and had the question of the Union remained the great factor in the division of political parties, it can hardly be doubted that Liberal and Conservative Unionists would have been compelled ultimately to merge their forces, and that with Lord Salisbury leading the Peers, and Lord Hartington the Commons, the country might have seen formed as its best bulwark against a great danger the strongest Administration of modern times.

In the last speech made by Lord Hartington whilst a member of the House of Commons,* he declared his conviction that the course taken in 1886 by Liberals 'who had been 'deserted by their Liberal friends' was the right course, and probably there are few Liberals practically engaged in politics who do not now see that the policy of independent alliance with the Conservative party gave greater strength to the Unionist cause than it could then have acquired by a complete fusion of Liberal and Conservative Unionists. Since that time, as Lord Hartington pointed out, it may be that experience has tended to show that those who, in a long Parliament, have been working together for common objects may be able in the future to act together in the service of their country under a common leadership. Upon that question Lord Hartington expressly guarded himself from 'pronouncing any final or conclusive opinion.' It is quite clear that the party arrangements which have characterised the present Parliament will endure to its close; and that it is vain to attempt to forecast the political arrangements which will follow the assembling of the next Parliament. It will not be at once that the full effect of the departure of Lord Hartington from the House of Commons will be felt.

In the value of the service which he has rendered to the Unionist cause, Mr. Chamberlain is second only to Lord Hartington. As an advanced Radical himself, and as the leader of the advanced Radicals, of whom the great majority of the rank and file adhered to Mr. Gladstone, his position has been a peculiarly difficult one. No one had a greater

* Speech at banquet to Mr. Goschen in Edinburgh, Nov. 20, 1891.

personal interest than Mr. Chamberlain in preventing a rupture of the Liberal party. That the party should remain strong and united under the lead of Mr. Gladstone was till 1886 the desire of every Liberal Unionist; and for Mr. Chamberlain assuredly, not less than for others, such a prospect must have had many attractions. Mr. Chamberlain has sacrificed much by his steadfast adherence to the great principle of the united nationality of the three kingdoms. It was not, indeed, till he had been a member of a Cabinet, actually engaged in the manufacture of a Home Rule Bill, that he became fully convinced of the impossibility of satisfying Irish aspirations for separate nationality, and at the same time preserving the unity of the great nation of which Irishmen form part. It was evidently at first the specific example of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, rather than the full perception of the utter fallacy of the principle of separate nationalism necessarily involved in the grant of an Irish Parliament, which drove Mr. Chamberlain into opposition to his former chief. In the House of Commons he now stands first as the representative of Liberal Unionism; and Liberal Unionists there and in the country look forward with well-founded hope to his leadership to confirm them in that steadfast course which, under the guidance of Lord Hartington, has been productive of so much benefit to the State.

The position of the leader of a third party is an extremely difficult one. The least suspicion of intrigue, however little deserved, would have weakened to an incalculable degree the influence of the Liberal Unionist leader. But Lord Hartington was the most generally trusted of all public men, as much trusted by his opponents as by those who followed his standard. No one, however much opposed to his policy, thought of attributing to Lord Hartington any but the highest and most patriotic motives. In a time of party disruption it is impossible to over-estimate the importance of such a man to the House of Commons; and it is equally impossible to suppose that by speeches in the House of Lords or on the public platform, however admirable and useful they may be, the loss of his daily, almost hourly, influence on the course of political events at Westminster can be adequately compensated. The party, however, which Lord Hartington has led, and which the Duke of Devonshire will continue to lead, is not merely the band of Liberal Unionist members who have sat behind him in the House of Commons. Of the great body of Liberal public opinion which has declared in favour of the Union, the Duke of Devonshire will be the

truest representative, and the most trusted exponent; none the less that he has unfortunately been removed from the field where his energies were more immediately exercised.

Since last session Mr. Smith and Mr. Parnell have also passed away from the House of Commons—the former regretted and respected by men of all parties as a conscientious and public-spirited statesman. Six years ago no one would have predicted that Mr. Smith would ever lead the House of Commons. Yet it was to him that Lord Salisbury turned in the confusion brought about by the sudden resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill, and the choice has been amply justified. Mr. Smith's transparent sincerity, his conciliatory bearing, his clear head and businesslike habits, his devotion to the public service, and the entire absence from his character of a self-seeking or personal ambition, earned for him both the goodwill and the confidence of the House of Commons during a period, moreover, of great difficulty, caused by the disruption of old party connexions, when possibly a more brilliant leader might have proved far less successful.

Mr. Parnell's death, coming so soon after his fall, undoubtedly makes a considerable change in the political situation. In three Parliaments he has been a great power. It required a strong man to unite Irish members into one political body, to get them to act as an independent party, and to throw its weight into the Liberal or the Conservative scale with sole regard to the willingness of either party to promote his great end of establishing an Irish nation, 'which should take its place amongst the other nations of the earth.' He pursued his policy with great ability, with unflinching perseverance, and, up to a point, with conspicuous success. He had dismissed and had made Ministries. His triumph was great when, in 1886, he had at his feet the most popular leader whom the British democracy has known, and when he saw his much-vilified policy of Home Rule for Ireland solemnly adopted by Mr. Gladstone himself as the destined work of the Liberal party. Mr. Parnell's power was due to the complete independence of British parties which characterised his own action—an independence which he had succeeded in impressing upon his followers. There is no one now to play the game which Mr. Parnell played. When the Irish Home Rule leader was dismissed because his leadership had become odious to English Liberals, a blow was received by the Irish Home Rule party which shook to the foundations the strength of that edifice which Mr.

Parnell had raised with so much labour and success. It was Mr. Gladstone himself who struck this vigorous blow on behalf of the Union. Even in the choice of an Irish leader British opinion had a right to weigh; very much, indeed, as Irish opinion weighs heavily in maintaining in England the party leadership of Mr. Gladstone himself. It is to the opinion of the United Kingdom as a whole, before which Mr. Parnell, no less than Mr. Gladstone, must bend. Mr. Parnell has quitted the scene, and the force that he commanded has become but an irregular advance guard of Mr. Gladstone's own party—a change satisfactory possibly to Gladstonian partisans, but absolute death to Mr. Parnell's policy of extorting from rival British factions concessions which nothing but force will induce British statesmen to yield. Present circumstances do not admit of a repetition of Mr. Parnell's game, and if they did there is no Mr. Parnell capable of playing it.

But the chief interest in the last session of the existing Parliament lies in the fact that it is the first session of the new leader of the House of Commons. It is the commencement of a new era of party history, for the leadership of Mr. Balfour means nothing less than this. Nothing can be less like the condition of affairs in which Mr. Smith was asked to take the lead of the House of Commons than the circumstances under which Mr. Balfour succeeds him. Mr. Smith was a leader chosen to tide over a difficult, yet evidently only temporary, phase of party politics. Mr. Balfour's selection is due to the fact that he is the best administrator, the most brilliant debater, and the most trusted statesman in the Conservative party. As statesmen go, he is still young, and it is the hope of his party that his leadership may last for a generation. Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Chamberlain were Liberals, and Conservatives wanted a man of their own. Amongst Conservatives Mr. Balfour could have no rival. Mr. Goschen, it is true, had rendered tremendous services to that party as well as to the State; and his high position in the Government would, in the case of almost any other man, have been held to constitute a prior claim to the leadership of the House of Commons. 'Claims,' said Mr. Goschen himself, 'is a word we do not recognise in the Liberal Unionist party. With the example of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain before me, it would not have been within the traditions of the Liberal Unionist party that I should have thought of

‘claims.’* And the selection of Mr. Balfour has accordingly been welcomed with the utmost heartiness by both sections of Unionists. It is long since the Conservatives have had to lead them a minister so well qualified to enjoy their confidence and so likely to deserve it. The old Toryism of the past finds, it is true, little place in the mental equipment or habits of thought of the new Unionist leader. Liberal Unionists will look to his leadership to confirm his party in the path of steady progress and remedial legislation; for they do not forget that in Mr. Balfour’s administration of Ireland his determination to remedy grievances and to carry through reforms of the widest character was no less conspicuous than the firmness and courage with which he enforced the law.

The General Election must necessarily turn on the question of Home Rule. The Gladstonian leaders and a large number of the Gladstonian rank and file dislike this prospect, and with reason; but they cannot help themselves. No doubt in many cases individual seats will be lost and won, not by reason of the view which the electors take as to the government of Ireland and of the United Kingdom, but because of their strong feeling upon subjects which they think concern them much more closely. It is the policy of the Gladstonian managers to work upon the interests of the working classes, since the votes of the working men, if they can only be got to vote as a class, far outweigh the votes of the rest of the electorate. Their efforts are in vain. The policy of dividing the United Kingdom into two states, each governed by its own parliament elected upon a democratic franchise, and each parliament the absolute master of its own executive government, would create so complete a revolution in the constitution of the whole kingdom—in Great Britain as well as in Ireland—that it necessarily transcends in importance beyond all measure, in the eyes of enlightened men, the cries of ‘The village for the villagers,’ ‘Eight-hours Bills,’ ‘One man one vote,’ and other electioneering claptrap with which the ears of electors are assailed. In spite of the efforts of the wirepullers, and the platforms and programmes of national caucuses, the character, the power, and the duration of the next Parliament will depend, not upon the views that the new members may profess upon these minor subjects, but upon the principles they hold as to the future government of the United Kingdom. It is a clear testimony to

* Mr. Goschen in Edinburgh, November 20, 1891.

the strength with which Unionist principles are held by the electors that Mr. Gladstone should a second time endeavour to carry Home Rule by a party vote of his supporters without consulting the wishes of the electorate upon his scheme of reform. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone endeavoured by every means in his power to coerce and persuade his followers to pass a measure diametrically opposed to the declarations of himself and his colleagues when seeking the support of the constituencies a few months previously. Had Parliament passed Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, it would have been guilty of a fraud upon the people. In 1886 the people as soon as they were consulted condemned the Bill. What, then, are the tactics of the Gladstonian leaders in expectation of the General Election of 1892? Their tactics are to keep their proposal a second time back from the people till it is too late for the people to pronounce against it at the polling-booth. And these statesmen are themselves the leaders of the popular party, of the British democracy, who prate of government for the people and by the people, yet who are straining every nerve and outraging every principle of fair and honest treatment of the people in order to keep them in the dark as to the revolution they intend to effect in the whole system of the popular government! Assuredly in the past no reformers have ever sought in such a fashion as this to carry out their reforms. The insolent contempt for public opinion, for the judgement of the country, that characterises the demand made by Mr. Gladstone and his chief lieutenants for *carte blanche* to remould our political institutions according to their will and pleasure, shows how little these gentlemen have in common with former Liberal statesmen. If a member of Parliament prefers his principles to his leader, he becomes that most odious of political persons—'a dissentient.' Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt want no more dissentients. But if the constituencies are not to know till after the General Election what is in contemplation, and when it is over their representatives are to be bound to accept whatever their leaders put before them, we fail to perceive where it is that popular government comes in. Neither the representatives nor the represented are to have any voice in the matter. Why not imitate the Napoleonic plan of a plébiscite at once, and give to Mr. Gladstone full authority to create for the United Kingdom such institutions as he pleases? Provided, of course, as Mr. Gladstone and his friends always insist, that the new

constitution is made acceptable to the representatives of the *Irish* people.

If the sole object of the leaders of the Opposition is to gain a majority at the forthcoming General Election, their tactics, perhaps, have something to recommend them. It is, alas ! the manœuvring of the wirepuller and election agent, where we have a right to look for the frank and open political action of constitutional statesmen. If, on the other hand, the real wish of Home Rule statesmen is to gain legislative effect for their Home Rule policy, we think their conduct is as shortsighted as it is immoral. It is time to speak plainly. In these days a mighty constitutional change cannot be effected by a species of political legerdemain. The British people whom these changes affect cannot be debarred from themselves deciding whether or no they will accept them. Nothing less than an overwhelming force of public opinion will be sufficient to accomplish the recasting of the relations between the people of the British Islands. No ! If we have amongst us statesmen who really hope to found the constitutions of the two islands on a separate national basis, they must have recourse to the methods of statesmanship in a self-governing country. They must trust—it will not suffice merely to flatter—the people ; they must reason with their opponents ; they must face criticism ; they must discover some project for accomplishing their purpose sufficiently robust to bear the light of day. The whole course of the Opposition upon this great controversy has been such as to force upon the mind of the least suspicious the uncomfortable doubt whether distinguished Home Rulers themselves have any faith in Home Rule. If this policy is, in truth, the main plank in the Gladstonian platform, why are no great meetings held to urge it forward ? Gladstonian conferences, like the speeches of Gladstonian statesmen, are occupied with everything except with that which we are told is to be the first work of their party. The greatest efforts are made, for instance, to get up demonstrations and conferences of agricultural labourers. To bring them about the managers and plutocrats of the party grudge neither time nor money. Mr. Gladstone himself attends them, expatiates on village councils, and appropriates much of the language which he and his friends formerly left to Mr. Jesse Collings. Why not hold a HOME RULE conference by way of a change ? Why not ‘demonstrate’ in favour of federalising the Constitution, if that is the object ? or of turning Ireland into a self-governing colony, if that course is preferred ? Why, in

the name of common sense, are rural reforms to be a fit subject of discussion at conferences of the Gladstonian party whilst the whole subject of Home Rule is to be tabooed? When we consider a little later the few Home Rule utterances which Home Rule statesmen have allowed to escape them, the present reticence of the party will be understood.

The Gladstonian party is, in short, moving heaven and earth to gain a majority, whilst it has abandoned the attempt to popularise Home Rule, or to show its practicability, or to defend it against the arguments of Unionists. The great object is to gain the votes of agricultural labourers. The adoption of household franchise in the counties was the work of the Liberal party. It was founded on the belief that the rural labourer, no less than the town labourer, was worthy of being consulted as a citizen in the choice of the representatives of the nation. Appeals are, however, now made to the agricultural labourer, based apparently on the belief that with the great concerns of the nation and the empire the agricultural labourer has nothing whatever to do, and that his vote will be dictated solely by a consideration of his own material advantage: To address a class higher in the social scale in language of this kind would be to insult it, and, in the long run, politicians and candidates will learn, perhaps, that rural labourers are to be treated with no less respect than other classes of the community, if their favour is to be permanently retained.

It is in the nature of things that an Opposition should beat a Government in promising. And the less scrupulous the Opposition and the more scrupulous the Government the greater will be the success of the former in this not very noble competition. On the eve of a General Election assuredly—

‘Promising is the very air o’ the time: it opens the eyes of expectation: performance is ever the duller for his act: and, but in the plainer and simpler kind of people, the deed of saying is quite out of use. To promise is most courtly and fashionable: performance is a kind of will, or testament, which argues a great sickness in his judgement that makes it.’ *

Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt are apt pupils of the Painter in the Shakespearian play. With them promising may seem to pay. Perhaps for a time it may, if it is office only which the Gladstonian party wishes to purchase. But what advance is thereby made towards giving effect to the

* ‘Timon of Athens,’ v. 1.

policy of Home Rule in the very teeth of a public opinion which condemns it? Public opinion cannot be claimed in favour of Home Rule because agricultural labourers show a touchingly simple faith in the professions of Sir William Harcourt's lavish intentions towards their class. The fact is that, if Home Rule is ever to be carried, it can only be because public opinion has become converted to Home Rule. It is curious that statesmen, calling themselves Liberal, should have forgotten the first principles of popular government, and should have abandoned all efforts to carry with them the mind of the people in the policy which they profess to have at heart.

What do the Opposition propose to do? Mr. Gladstone, at Newcastle, on October 2, 1891, made a speech which has since been treated by his followers as the formal enunciation of the views of his party. There is very much in that speech upon which it would be tempting to comment did we not wish to confine our attention solely to its character as a programme of work which it is the intention of the Gladstonian party to undertake, and as an expression of the thoughts of the leader of the party thereupon. Mr. Gladstone declares (1) that 'the question of shortening the duration of parliaments manifestly demands, and ever will demand, the earliest opportunity that can justly and wisely be chosen for the purpose.' (2) That 'the readjustment of taxation . . . will, when its turn comes, have practical and decisive attention.' (3) That 'he will rejoice if—before the time comes for the present Administration to give up the ghost—it be possible for Lord Salisbury to make an effort to relieve us from our burdensome and embarrassing occupation of Egypt.' (4) Mr. Gladstone trusts that among the improvements of the liquor laws 'there may be found a fair and just acknowledgement of the rights of local populations to deal in a proper manner with any question whether there shall or shall not be within their borders any acknowledgement of public-house traffic at all.' (5) Mr. Gladstone mentions

'Scotch and Welsh, or, perhaps he should say, Welsh and Scotch Disestablishment. He is careful to avoid all attempts to determine any question of precedence as between the two. It is no affair of his. He is a resident in Wales, and he is a Scotch representative. He will not embroil himself in what would be for him an empty and fruitless controversy. But he would assure both Scotland and Wales that they have the unanimous support of the Liberal party.' (6) 'There is the question of the House of Lords. It is a large and difficult subject,

. . . He hopes—nay, he believes—that the House of Lords will not accept the deplorable suggestion tendered to them by the Prime Minister. . . . He knows well that if they were reduced to a policy so unfortunate they themselves would be the first to repent of it. . . . The question—the important question—was, how were we to decide upon the title to precedence among the many subjects that were before us? In connexion with precedence, one name that would leap to the lips of any man addressing them was the name of Ireland. As to the title of Ireland to the precedence, there was no question at all about it—it was a matter fixed and settled and determined long ago, upon reasons which, in his opinion—and what was much more, in the opinion of the people—could not be refuted, could not even be contested.'

(7) He declares in favour of registration reform, and 'one man one vote,' and (8) wishes to see more labour members in Parliament, and more labour candidates before the constituencies; but this, he declares, will entail that

'the necessary expenses of elections should not be drawn from the pockets of candidates, but from the public funds. In electing labour members, the constituencies are conferring a boon upon the public. . . . Nothing, he held, could be clearer than the title of such men—men whose private means were inadequate to the performance of the public duty put on them—to receive such aid from the public treasury as may be necessary in order to enable them to discharge the tasks which, for the public benefit, as well as under public authority, have been imposed upon them. He did not enter into other questions connected with the subject of a pecuniary provision of this kind. He only stated, and stated with very great confidence of conviction, the proposition which had just proceeded from his lips.'

(9) Mr. Gladstone then proceeds to declare that when the Liberal party had

'sufficient power and influence in Parliament, it would proceed to provide for district and parish councils . . . and it would be desirable to enact compulsory powers for the purpose of enabling suitable bodies to acquire land on fair and suitable terms, in order to place the rural population in nearer relations to the land, to the use and profit of the land which they have so long tilled for the benefit of others, but for themselves almost in vain.'

(10) Mr. Gladstone declares for the 'abolition of the present system of entail, together with just facilities for the transfer of land,' and (11) as to the Eight Hours Bill, he requires to be assured that the compulsory enactment of shorter hours would not be followed by a reduction of wages. He doubts whether it is right

'to make men the subjects of coercive proceedings if they are unwilling, or if they find themselves unable, in justice to those dependent upon them, to conform to the new standard. He gave no absolute judge-

ment upon a question which had not yet, he believed, by an appeal to the country, been sufficiently examined; but he recommended much circumspection, and much careful examination before proceeding to steps, or even to the recommendation of steps, which may prove to be at once premature and irretrievable, and which, therefore, ought not to be hastily adopted.'

(12) Mr. Gladstone rejoices that the Government are going to introduce a Local Government Bill for Ireland, 'one of his reasons being that whatever local government is established in Ireland must assist the Irish people in the demand for their national rights;' but the Bill will not 'be a real affirmation of the principle of equal rights.' There can be no local government without the control of the police; 'as well talk of establishing a House of Commons, and yet depriving it of the power of regulating and deciding the taxes of the people!' When the Bill appears 'he will endeavour to resist and arrest what is bad, to extend and develop what is good, and to make it subservient' to 'the purposes of sound and enlightened government.'

We have thought it right to give the actual words of Mr. Gladstone in declaring the policy of his party and his own views on the twelve principal questions dealt with in his speech. We find him declaring in favour of Short Parliaments, Readjusted Taxation, Evacuation of Egypt, Local Option, Scotch and Welsh Disestablishment, Registration Reform, Payment of Members, Establishment of District and Parish Councils, Abolition of Entail and the Facilitating of Land Transfer. As to the Eight Hours Bill, he delays giving judgement till after the General Election. These, together with ominous warnings to the House of Lords and a few remarks on the subject of Irish Local Government, constitute the whole of that speech, which is considered by a great political party as the best expression of its principles. 'Ireland is to take precedence of every thing else,' but there is not a word as to what he intends to do with Ireland!

All this is, of course, a mere bidding for votes, and can never constitute the permanent basis of a party. A Gladstonian majority will not, we are quite sure, hurriedly decree its own death by passing a Triennial Act. The merits, as well as the attraction, of readjusted taxation depend upon the 'readjustments' in contemplation. Mr. Morley has already explained that Mr. Gladstone does not contemplate the immediate evacuation of Egypt. Local Option has been declared for by majorities of the House of Commons in-

dependent of party, at frequent intervals during the last ten years. As regards Disestablishment, Mr. Gladstone will not move till the ticklish question of 'precedence,' with which he has nothing to do, has been first settled. His registration reform touches the merest fringe of a question, the ultimate solution of which is the establishment of equal electoral districts. The Government have themselves proposed, as part of their Local Government scheme for England, the establishment of District Councils in England and Parish Councils in Scotland. The Lord Chancellor has already been endeavouring to pass a Bill to facilitate land transfer, whilst the present Government is the only Government which has made any advance whatever towards establishing in England a close connexion between the agricultural occupier and the land he tills. As to the Eight Hours Bill, Mr. Gladstone will not declare for or against it till after the General Election. Payment of members of Parliament is indeed a new plank in the platform of the Liberal party; and the words in which Mr. Gladstone accepts it deserve to be carefully noted. This is not the first occasion on which his utterances have indicated that he favours a very limited application of the principle involved. His language at Newcastle shows that it is the labour members only (who at the present time happen to be all members of the Gladstonian party) who are to be salaried by the State; or at least that State pay is to be given to those only who make some kind of claim for it on the ground of poverty, as has been the case with claims to ministers' pensions—a precedent which ought surely to be most carefully avoided. The proposal to make a seat in the House of Commons a paid office is a proposal fraught with the most important consequences. Mr. Gladstone can hardly be said to discuss it on its merits, though he declares in its favour. If 670 offices are to be created, each worth 400*l.* or 500*l.* a year, as a reward for obtaining the confidence of a constituency, it is not the working men who are to be congratulated. It is the junior bar of England. There will assuredly henceforth be no lack of candidates, though whether their quality will be as much increased as their quantity remains to be seen.

It is, however, only when the demands formulated by Mr. Gladstone are urged by his candidates in the constituencies that the height to which 'promising' has attained can be fully appreciated. Mr. Gladstone's whole programme is indeed, in his own mouth, a series of promises, incapable of ful-

filment by reason that it is postponed to 'Ireland.' That question, he tells us himself, is to come first. Yet he and his colleagues are in terror lest his Irish policy should be known ; in terror lest, after it is known, the British people should be asked their opinion upon it ; and in terror lest even, shortly after its adoption, they should have to face the electors. Was ever a popular party in so much dread of the people ?

It is sufficiently amusing to listen to the fulminations of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, and Sir William Harcourt against the House of Lords. It is not the House of Lords they are afraid of, but what stands behind it. The Peers in 1832, in 1884, and on some other occasions, have endeavoured to uphold privilege against the people. In 1893 or 1894 they may be, perhaps, the firmest assertors of popular rights. London and Liverpool, Birmingham and Manchester, and half the great towns of the kingdom, may not improbably be found imploring the House of Lords not to suffer the United Kingdom to be broken up till the country has had its say. Ministers will tremble ; for the platform upon which they stand is only the fragile structure raised at Newcastle. The agricultural labourers may have been flattered with success. Mr. Gladstone may have got his majority, but the Government will require a better bulwark than that to protect them against the indignation of an awakened people.

The Newcastle programme need not be taken seriously. The Home Rule Bill, it is agreed, is to have precedence of everything else. That Bill will be either defeated or passed. If the former, the Home Rule ministry will at once be forced to the alternative of resignation or dissolution. Lord Hartington has further proved that the passage of a Home Rule measure through Parliament, no less than its rejection, would entail an immediate appeal to the people. Had the measure of 1886 become law, Irish Peers and Irish members of the House of Commons would have ceased to form part of the Parliament at Westminster. 'It would be hardly possible that a Parliament which had been summoned as a Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland should continue to sit and legislate when it had become the Parliament of Great Britain alone.' If, however, Lord Hartington continued, people are right in believing

'that, according to the very slight glimmer of light that has been vouchsafed to us, the Irish members are to remain at Westminster, but in diminished numbers, it is even more necessary and essential that as

soon as a new Government of Ireland Bill comes into force the Parliament which enacts it should be dissolved. How are these remaining Irish members to be selected? I do not suppose it would be proposed that the present Irish members would be allowed to ballot amongst themselves who is to have the honour, or who is to have the burden, of continuing to sit in the House of Commons to take part in the discussion of Imperial affairs. It will be necessary that new Irish constituencies should be created to say whom they will have to represent them in the Imperial Parliament, and as soon as this measure comes into law it will be necessary that a dissolution should take place, and an appeal should be made to the constituencies in order that Parliament may be reconstituted as soon as possible, in the form which in its own wisdom it has decreed it is hereafter to assume.'

Mr. Gladstone, in giving precedence to Ireland, has thus relegated, so far as his party is concerned, the settlement of other questions to the 'dim and distant future,' with which the next Parliament but one will have to deal. Once more we find ourselves compelled to recognise that the real, the sole question of the day, is the question of Home Rule. We need not at the present time enter again into the merits of that great controversy. It is a subject about which men must make up their minds one way or the other, for it admits of no possible compromise. National Parliamentary sovereignty must remain at Westminster, in fact as well as in theory. Mr. John Bright expressed the views of every true Unionist when he declared that, for his part, 'he did not discuss the question of a little more or a little less of a Parliament in Dublin. A Parliament was a great weapon if once created and opened—not difficult to form, but dangerous to deal with.'

The great speech of the Duke of Argyll at Manchester dealt, in a singularly forcible manner, with the fundamental fallacies upon which Home Rulers build, and must surely have made some of his opponents ask themselves what it is they mean by proposing to endow Ireland with 'national' institutions. Mr. Gladstone has himself told us, as the Duke pointed out, that 'it would be fatuity as regards the Liberal party, and treachery as regards the Irish people,' to abandon the lines of his measure of 1886. And the Duke rightly insisted that three further conditions were necessarily involved in any future measure—viz. 'the breaking up of the Imperial Parliament into two or more separate bodies, the complete separation of all Irish national affairs from imperial affairs, and the breaking up of the Imperial Executive into two or more separate executives, dealing with separate matters of legislation

‘and administration.’ Whilst such great questions as these await decision, it is childish to suppose that the very intelligible efforts of certain colleagues of Mr. Gladstone to force other issues on the country can be successful.

It is a strange fact that men who approved of the measure of 1886—nay, who were responsible for its introduction—and who are apparently perfectly ready to support again a Bill ‘upon the same lines,’ use language inconsistent with the appreciation of its fundamental principles. Lord Rosebery in 1889 suggested, apparently as a solution of Home Rule difficulties, that the House of Commons should be divided into grand committees, framed mainly ‘upon a national basis,’ to deal separately with the affairs of ‘England, Scotland, and Ireland.’ In the same year Mr. Askwith, a distinguished Home Rule member of Parliament, ‘after much reflection’ announced his main principle to be the retention at Westminster of ‘an Imperial Parliament whose unquestioned and unquestionable sovereignty over all persons and in all matters, local or imperial, should remain intact and unimpaired.’ Professor Freeman has declared his horror at any proposal to reconstruct the British constitution on federal lines. According to this eminent Home Ruler, Ireland is to be a dependency with internal self-government, but on questions of wider importance to be entirely subordinate to the superior authority of Great Britain, from whose Imperial Parliament she is of course to be entirely excluded.

Thus we find three prominent members of the Home Rule party urging in perfectly good faith their several plans for satisfying the national aspirations of the Irish people. The first does not ask for an Irish Parliament at all, the second asks for an Irish Parliament which shall be subordinate in fact as well as in theory as to every local and Irish matter to the Parliament at Westminster, whilst the third would give a Parliament to Irishmen supreme in local matters, but which should be entirely subject in all the most important matters which affect the Irish ‘nation’ to a British Parliament, in which no representative of Ireland is to have a voice. Sir William Harcourt avoids the perils of precision in his recent declaration to the electors of Dorsetshire. ‘The Liberal party is pledged to see justice to Ireland, and to give to the people of that country, in the form of Home Rule, a right to manage their local affairs, and that pledge they would perform.’ This is, in truth, the only manner in which the portentous policy of Mr. Gladstone can after six years of controversy be safely put before the British people.

Mr. Balfour, in his determination to push forward an Irish Local Government Bill in the last session of the present Parliament and the first session of his own leadership, has before him a difficult task. On his own side of the House, amongst the more Conservative section of his supporters, there will be, without any doubt, a manifestation of unwillingness to entrust the democracy of the Irish counties with the local functions imposed in Great Britain upon English and Scottish householders. The duty of making and repairing roads and bridges, the management of lunatic asylums, and so forth, it will be contended, are at present admirably and economically performed. The occasional follies, maladministrations, and corruption of Irish Boards of Guardians will be held up, not without effect, as a warning of what representative government in Ireland really means. Nevertheless, we hope that Mr. Balfour will persevere in his adherence to the wise line of policy which he indicated in his speech at Plymouth. There is no analogy between the claim of Mr. Parnell or Mr. Davitt for national rights, and the desire to place in the hands of ratepayers the parochial or local functions hitherto exercised by privileged classes or central authority. There is here no question of nationality, no question of sovereignty involved. Security must be taken in the special circumstances of Ireland to guard against maladministration, and against an inequitable use of the powers which it is intended to entrust to representatives of the local public; and there is no inherent impossibility of obtaining such security. Doubtless, Irish County Councils will occasionally act in a manner to startle the staid opinions of the sober British public. Possibly, for a time, local administration may be less perfect than at present, and more costly. Irishmen, like other men, will have to learn from experience. The Irish people cannot be always kept in a state of tutelage; and it is time that Irishmen should learn that in the co-operation of all classes lies the best chance of securing the local advantage of the whole community. Irish Unionists stand on firm ground, and enjoy the support of British public opinion, when they assert their claim to equal rights with Englishmen and Scotchmen to be governed by the same Parliament which governs Great Britain. Their position would indeed be changed were they to contend for the maintenance of the class privileges of Irish landlords, privileges which on this side of the Irish Channel a Unionist Government has swept away.

The policy of the Government must continue such as it has been during the last six years: maintenance of the Union, ac-

accompanied by firm administration of the law, and by measures of domestic reform. It is fortunate for the Government that their Home Rule and Radical opponents have bound themselves to a policy which must of necessity postpone the legislative accomplishment of their wishes till the Irish controversy has been laid to rest. With those who resist Home Rule lies the power to carry forward the nation along the path of progress. On every side there is work to be done, for which the country cannot afford to wait till years of struggle have been spent over the interminable question of Ireland. The times are critical; but if Unionists remain true to themselves, the country may well look forward to a long renewal of the prosperity at home and abroad which has distinguished the career of the Parliament now drawing to a close.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1892.

No. CCCLX.

- ART. I. - 1. *The Ice Age in North America, and its Bearings upon the Antiquity of Man.* By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D. London: 1890.
2. *The Climatic Changes of Later Geological Times: a Discussion based on Observations made in the Cordilleras of North America.* By J. D. WHITNEY. Memoirs of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College. Vol. VII. Cambridge, U.S.A.: 1882.
3. *The Cause of an Ice Age.* By Sir ROBERT STAWELL BALL, F.R.S., Royal Astronomer of Ireland. London: 1892.

THE changes of terrestrial climate have been many and various. Myrtles and tree-ferns once flourished in Greenland; coral-insects built on the shores of Melville Island; nautiluses sailed over what must then have been the tepid seas about Spitzbergen. But with the lapse of ages, the scene changed, and worse than arctic rigours spread into regions now enjoying a temperate climate. Possibly not for the first time. The Permian was certainly an inclement age; and its inclemency seems even to have reached the point of glaciation in the west of England and Ireland; yet it was preceded and succeeded by a long prevalence of tropical conditions. These assuredly reigned without interruption, in north temperate and polar regions, throughout the vast expanse of Tertiary time. Palms and cycads then sprang up in the room of oaks and beeches in England; turtles and crocodiles haunted English rivers and estuaries; lions, elephants, and hyænas roamed at large over English dry land. In Switzerland, a mean temperature equal to

that of North Africa at the present time is shown by its fossil flora to have prevailed during the Miocene, or Middle Tertiary, epoch. Anthropoid apes lived in Germany and France; fig and cinnamon trees flourished at Dantzic; in Greenland, up to 70 degrees of latitude, magnolias bloomed, and vines ripened their fruit: while in Spitzbergen, and even in Grinnell Land, within little more than eight degrees of the pole, swamp-cypresses and walnuts, cedars, limes, planes, and poplars grew freely, water-lilies covered over standing pools, and irises lifted their tall heads by the margins of streams and rivers.*

This genial uniformity of warmth may very well have lasted some hundreds of thousands of years; but at last it began to give way. An unfavourable change set in, and progressed. Slowly the seasons grew more inclement; delicate species of plants perished, or took to flight after the fashion of vegetables, by the diffusion of their seeds to more suitable localities; and animals which had long thriven and multiplied up to, if not within, the Arctic circle, were finally compelled to migrate southward. Precipitation, moreover, took the form of snow, and became so copious that the summer suns no longer availed to melt the wintry deposits; and the continents, by this time compacted into very much their present shapes, acquired, year by year, an added burden of ice. Eventually, then, the glacial flood submerged Northern Europe, and reduced the whole Dominion of Canada, and a great part of the United States, to the actual condition of Greenland. Ice, in short, appropriated an immense territory which it has since been obliged to relinquish. Nor is it easy to say why this was so. Assuredly, no theories of general refrigeration can explain the facts. There was indeed doubtless a very early time when the earth lived mainly on its own heat-capital, and took small account of the yearly income derived from the sun. The vicissitudes of seasons, and the effects of geographical position, were then comparatively little felt, a dense atmosphere serving as a storehouse for radiations from the interior which reached the surface no less freely at the poles than at the equator. Even still, according to Sir William Thomson's estimate,† our globe loses annually, by diffusion into space of its own primitive and irrecoverable supply, heat enough to raise one hundred rocky masses, equal to itself in bulk, from the

* Wallace, 'Island Life,' chap. ix.

† Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, vol. v. p. 513.

temperature of freezing to that of boiling water. And a very slight check upon this immense outpouring of subterranean warmth would unquestionably tend to produce equable and genial climates irrespective of latitude. Such a check would be imposed by a trifling increase in the thickness of the earth's atmospheric covering, which there is every reason to suppose was, in the far past, much less pervious to heat-rays than it is now. But variations in the efficiency of this cause of terrestrial warmth cannot be reckoned upon to explain all, or nearly all, the climatic diversities witnessed to by the rock-strata beneath our feet. Much evidence is at hand to show that, at any rate during the more recent geological times, the gases of our air were mixed appreciably in their actual proportions, and were present in appreciably their actual volumes. Tertiary heat, then, and quaternary cold alike remain inexplicable from this point of view. And indeed it must be admitted that most of the data recently collected, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, tell heavily against the most promising expedients hitherto thought of for clearing up the mystery of the Great Ice age.

Ice, although everywhere the same in substance and qualities, is capable of surprisingly varied behaviour under varied circumstances. It owns, too, sundry modes of origin. Thus, water-ice is formed directly and obviously on the surface of lakes, rivers, and seas; but land-ice indirectly, out of compressed snow. And the latter is the exclusive material of glaciers. It is, then, easily seen that a concurrence of special conditions is needed to produce them. The three most indispensable may be described as those of provision, production, and preservation. Supplies must be provided by abundant precipitation in the form of snow; the precipitation must take place on high ground to give gravity the opportunity of producing 'thick-ribbed ice' out of the air-wafted feathery crystals; finally, a low temperature must preserve the embryo glacier from premature melting. None of these requirements can be evaded. For want of sufficient snowfall, there are no glaciers on the Ural Mountains; for the want of sufficient elevations, there are no glaciers in Newfoundland; owing to excess of heat, there are no glaciers on Kilimanjaro or the Peruvian Andes.

Glaciers plunge into the sea, in many cold countries, and perish by drowning, their dismembered remains floating away as bergs. But their end is by dissolution where the annual mean temperature rises considerably above the freezing-point. At some certain level, they melt faster than they can

flow, and so terminate. The level, indeed, is a fluctuating one. Icelandic glaciers are now steadily advancing; Swiss glaciers, according to M. Forel,* have undergone, during the present century, five alternating periods of diminution and growth. The meteorological changes occasioning, and emphasised by, these oscillations are very slight. Their character, however, is unmistakable, and such as might have been anticipated. That is to say, glacial decrease accompanies a warm and dry cycle; glacial increase, one that is damp and cold. Considerable alarm was accordingly felt lest the flooding of the Sahara, numbered among the futile projects of a recent sanguine epoch, should result in a largely increased snowfall upon the Alps, and the consequent ice-submergence of inhabited valleys. Such fears, it is true, rested on a meteorological misapprehension, yet they were, in principle, well founded. The glacial balance is sensitive. A very slight continuous preponderance of supply over wasting might, in a few years, betray itself by really formidable and altogether irresistible effects. Without one additional degree of cold, it is conceivable that a persistently augmented deposit of snow upon the Gerstenhörner and the Schneestock, although otherwise scarcely perceptible, might enable the Rhone Glacier to overwhelm Brieg. But this would be an exceedingly small step towards the restoration of a former state of things, when an ice-stream close upon two hundred and fifty miles in length, starting from the same source, crossed the frozen or non-existent Lake of Geneva, and debouched by Culoz upon Lyons. Without severe cold as well as heavy precipitation, ice could not possibly have gained so great an ascendancy. And this was no local phenomenon; it was simultaneously prevalent over widely separated tracts of the earth's surface.

The geological importance of ice is entirely due to its powers of travel and transport. The movement of glaciers is the outcome of a highly complex set of causes. They neither flow, nor slide, nor roll; but their onward and downward march partakes to some extent of the nature of all those three modes of progression. The particles composing them shift, not so much because they are pushed or pulled by their comrades, as because their individual energies impel them so to do. Not that they yield spontaneously, like water-particles, to the immediate solicitations of gravity. The whole of their concentrated energies are addressed

* Archives des Sciences, tom. xiv. p. 503, 1886.

towards thrusting and shoving their neighbours, descent from a higher to a lower level coming in as a secondary effect of alternate intensifications and relaxations in *personal* molecular struggles for elbow-room. Ice dilates and contracts more than most other solids under the influence of temperature-changes. The proportion, for instance, of the expansion with each added degree of heat (of course below 32° F.) is more than three times that of iron. Now glacier-ice is subject to continual vicissitudes of temperature; hence its volume fluctuates largely; and every fluctuation of volume in a mass of matter placed on sloping ground tends necessarily to bring it nearer the bottom. For the pull of gravity is unceasing and penetrative; internal movements of all kinds are more or less swayed by it; and molecular swinging can thus be turned, through its influence, into molar displacement. The effect may be experimentally observed in a sheet of lead, nailed by its upper end to an inclined plane, and by turns cooled and heated; after a little while, it will actually extract the attaching nails in the vigour of its efforts to slide downward.* The late Canon Moseley was the first to point out this doubtless operative cause of glacier-motion.

Another, and a potent one, is to be found in the infiltration of water. Within every portion of the substance of ice-streams, melting and regelation are incessantly going on. But water cannot freeze without opening out the serried ranks of its particles; the consequent distension of the imbued mass must be accomplished in the direction of least resistance; and that lies, approximately, along the axis of the containing valley. From these incessant infinitesimal transitions between the liquid and solid states, moreover, the moving bulk derives plasticity, enabling it to adapt itself to all the sinuosities and inequalities of its route.

Although the flow of ice is essentially different, in its inner mechanism, from the flow of water, it resembles it in several of its outward features, especially in the gradations of its velocity. A glacier, like a river, and even more than a river, is held back by the friction of its bed. Hence its speed attains a maximum in the middle and at the surface, but diminishes gradually towards the shores and bottom. This maximum, too, is displaced, as in rushing water, towards the concave side of every curve in its course. The rate of movement varies enormously in different

* Prestwich, 'Geology,' vol. i. pp. 181-3.

glaciers, or rather in different glacier-systems. In the Mer de Glace at Chamouni it attains to thirty-three inches a day in July, but falls off to about half that amount in winter. A ladder left by De Saussure at the base of the Aiguille Noire was picked up in 1832, after forty-four years, near Les Moulins, showing a mean annual progression of about 328 feet.* Identifiable débris travelling on the Aar glacier gave a result not materially different. So that, on the whole, the pace, in their central parts, of Alpine glaciers averages less than a foot a day, while rising, in the hottest months, to two or three feet.

But this is exceeded at least a score of times in Greenland. The great Jakobshavn glacier advances, according to the measurements in 1875 of Helland, a Norwegian geologist, between sixty and seventy feet daily.† And this over a slope of only about forty-five feet to the mile, or less than one-fifth the average inclination of the most nearly level among the Alpine ice-roads. Moreover, glacial movement in Greenland, as was ascertained by a Danish scientific expedition, is independent of seasons. No hibernal slackening affects it. Corresponding, and equally unexpected, results were obtained in Alaska by Dr. Wright, author of the valuable work from which this article is entitled. His observations were made on the Muir glacier, a majestic ice-flow, a mile wide at its mouth, and 1,000 feet deep. It forms the sole outlet to a vast amphitheatre, thirty to forty miles across, into which are poured the frozen contents of nine main and seventeen subordinate channels. The resulting tremendous ice-pressure goes far to explain the swiftness of flow through an overburdened passage. Although the central velocity of seventy feet a day in the Muir glacier slackens off at the margins to ten feet, the total discharge per diem of ice into the sea was estimated in August, 1886, at no less than two hundred million cubic feet. The commotion raised in Muir Inlet by the portentous ice *débâcle* always progressing at its upper end baffles description. The detonations accompanying the incessant 'calving' of icebergs echo among the mountains night and day like the booming of a cannonade; the very ground seems to tremble; the water boils and foams with the precipitation into it, minute by minute, of some ninety million pounds of ice, here in avalanches of ruin, there in gigantic detached

* Falsan, 'La Période Glaciaire,' p. 186.

† Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, vol. xxxiii. p. 149.

masses, tumbling and wallowing after the manner of uneasy leviathans.* The crash of blocks from an ice-front is strictly analogous, Dr. Wright remarks, to the plunge of a breaking wave, the toppling over, in each case, being due to frictional retardation of movement in the immediate vicinity of the ground. Hence the formation of bergs, at least in Alaska, is by projection forward, not by flotation upward.

The disparities in point of speed between the glaciers of the Old and New Worlds, although they were not anticipated, are easily explained:—

‘The movement of glacial ice,’ Dr. Wright tells us, ‘is affected much less by the slope of its bottom than by the size of the stream itself. The friction of the ice upon the bottom and sides of its channel is so great that, where the stream is both shallow and narrow, the motion must be almost completely retarded. On doubling the size of a semi-fluid stream the relative amount of friction becomes very much less, so that it will move more than twice as fast as before. This property of a semi-fluid is made sufficiently evident from a homely illustration. Molasses in cold weather will scarcely run at all through a gimlet-hole, while it will run with considerable freedom through an auger-hole. Now, the glaciers of the Alps, which were the subjects of Professor Tyndall’s measurements, were, in comparison to those in Greenland and Alaska, about in the proportion of a small gimlet-hole to a large auger-hole, and the faster motion is really not surprising.’ (*‘Ice Age,’* p. 72.)

Through their motion, glaciers record their history. They leave behind them, in perishing, attestations of existence that hold out

‘Against the wreckful siege of battering days.’

For their empty receptacles are distinctively fashioned and engraved. ‘From observations upon living glaciers,’ says Dr. Wright, ‘and from the known nature of ice, we may learn to recognise the track of a glacier as readily and unmistakably as we would the familiar footprints of an animal.’ By the effects of ice-grinding, rocks are smoothed and polished, rounded and mammillated. They are, moreover, striated. Ice has graving tools at command, and uses them to some purpose. Sharp-edged stones, pressed tightly in its stringent grip, against the rocky surfaces travelled over, leave them ineffaceably grooved and furrowed. And the action is, of course, mutual. Pebbles and boulders jammed in glaciers receive as well as inflict scratches. Markings of both descriptions, that is, on rocks in place,

* Wright’s ‘Ice Age,’ p. 46; H. B. Loomis, ‘American Journal of Science,’ vol. xl. p. 333, 1890.

and on transported rock-fragments, are among the leading symptoms of past glaciation. A great deal may yet be learned from their diversity. There are, to borrow Professor T. C. Chamberlin's words : *—

'ice-markings varying from lines of hair-like delicacy up through all grades of scratches, scorings, gouges, and scrapings, to great furrows so capacious as to be serviceable as roadways. There are grooves of wonderful straightness and also of remarkable and almost inexplicable sinuosity: there are wonderfully continuous lines, contrasted with jumping gouges; there are attenuated origins and attenuated terminations, abrupt beginnings and still more sudden endings; there are scorings in various attitudes on horizontal, on ascending, and on descending planes, on terraced surfaces, on rounded angles, on surfaces of horizontal or curved inclination, on vertically arched surfaces, on domes, on warped and overhanging surfaces. There are striae sharply characteristic of glaciers, and striae indicative of floating ice; many of the former, few of the latter.'

These may be called glacial hieroglyphics; glacial deposits are equally distinctive. They are of three principal kinds—ground-moraine, terminal moraine, and erratic boulders. Ground-moraine is composed of the pulverised detritus of worn-down strata, spread out, in part by the agency of turbid glacier-streams, over great tracts of land. A large part of the surface-soil of Great Britain and North America, known geologically as 'boulder-clay,' 'till,' or 'drift,' has thus originated. The materials of terminal moraines, on the other hand, are furnished by the disintegration of the peaks and ranges overhanging, and banking in glaciers. They are borne onward with them in their march, and flung down, like rubbish out of a dustman's cart, where that march comes to an end. The hummocky, pitted, or ridged structure of the resulting formation indicates its mode of growth by pell-mell accumulation, complicated with the caving-in of ice-tunnels, the sorting and ridging-up action of running water, and the slow melting of enormous ice-blocks, whereby hollows kept clear of *débris*—the so-called 'kettle-holes'—are created. Erratic boulders, finally, are isolated specimens of far-off strata, carried by ice-streams sometimes hundreds of miles from their primitive habitats, and abandoned on slopes or summits to serve as their flood-marks to future generations. From such travelling blocks, indeed, were derived the first hints of ancient glacial incursions. Playfair divined in 1802 something of their significance;

* Proceedings of the American Association of Science, p. 210, 1886.

Charpentier compared, in 1834, with convincing force, geological with modern traces of ice-action; Guyot, ten years later, pursued all the erratics of the Rhone Valley back to their original homes, and demonstrated the incompetence of water, but the perfect adaptation of ice, for their transport; while Agassiz, with his untiring industry, and strong synthetic imagination, gave effectual shape to the history of an all but universal Glacial Epoch.

And the theory, lopped of some excrescences and exaggerations, has stood its ground. The evidence in its favour is too solid to bear evasive treatment. Everywhere in Northern Europe rags and vestiges are to be met with of a coating of boulder-clay of undoubted glacial origin; the heights of Solferino, the huge embankments of the Dora Baltea, are among the terminal moraines of colossal Alpine ice-streams, long ago shrunk back to their fountain-heads; marks of ice-erosion and ice-scoring betray themselves to the most casual observation all along the line, from Cape Clear to Moscow; 'foundling-stones' innumerable have become, in widely separated localities, objects of popular superstition and scientific curiosity. A well-known erratic is the Pierre-à-Bot near Neufchatel, preserving, even in its present dilapidated condition, a bulk of 1,370 cubic metres; and a granite block of fifteen hundred tons' weight, transported by quaternary ice from Finland to the banks of the Neva, has been turned to account as a pedestal for the equestrian statue of Peter the Great simulating the office of a vedette just outside the Winter Palace.*

The correlation, however, of the facts observed in Europe with others of a like nature collected in different parts of the globe was evidently indispensable to their due discussion; and for this purpose the results of the United States Geological Survey have proved of the highest importance. Nor has the glacial history of that country failed to be elucidated as well by private explorers. Dr. Wright, for instance, entered upon his career as a glacial geologist during his summer vacations from the Oberlin Theological Seminary (Ohio), where he is still a Professor of New Testament Greek. His services were afterwards secured for the Survey; and he has actively shared in what may be called the delimitation of the ice-frontier of North America. His special function, accordingly, has been the discrimination of glaciated from non-glaciated areas; and few, we imagine,

* Falsan, '*La Période Glaciaire*,' pp. 72-6.

possess a surer *coup d'œil* for the vestiges of pre-historic ice-occupation. From practical work, he was led on to the eminently useful task of summarising, for the benefit of the general reading public, the mass of information accumulated by himself and his coadjutors; and he brought to its execution the valuable qualifications of wide personal experience, quiet enthusiasm for his subject, and a disinterested love of truth. He might indeed have trusted more than he has done to his own literary capabilities; for, in his laudable desire to let his fellow-labourers speak for themselves, he has unnecessarily, here and there, given to his admirably illustrated volume somewhat the air of a compilation. All friends of science, nevertheless, owe him gratitude for the production of a record of decisive importance as regards both the history and chronology of quaternary times.

The drift-bearing and boulder-strewn territory of North America is of an extent unparalleled elsewhere. It extends southward beyond Cincinnati, east and west between Vancouver's Island and New York.

'Off the coast of Maine,' our author informs us, 'the ice, at its culminating period, extended an unknown distance into the sea, surmounting the eminences of Mount Desert and all that rock-bound coast, and leaving its terminal deposits in water so deep that there is little hope of ever determining their exact situation. But in south-eastern Massachusetts the deposits emerge from the water as true moraines, and offer themselves as most interesting objects of study.' ('Ice Age,' p. 123.)

Nantucket was for some ages the site of a glacial outpost; Cape Cod is the remnant of a vast moraine; the city of Brooklyn is built on deposits of the same kind; the northern half of Staten Island in New York Harbour is covered 'with the peculiar combination of rounded knobs and circular depressions characteristic of moraines.' It was on ice-borne soil, too, that the Pilgrim Fathers landed from the 'Mayflower.' 'Irregular morainic accumulations' formed the hills which first greeted their eyes.

'In this case,' our present authority states, 'the soil composing them consists of sand, gravel, and boulders, which have been scraped off by the ice from the mountains and ledges of New Hampshire and the intervening portions of Massachusetts, transported to the glacial margin, and there deposited in such quantities as to constitute the whole south-eastern portion of the latter State. The three hundred and sixty lakes of Plymouth township are nothing else than a cluster of kettle-holes. Manomet Hill, south-east of Plymouth, is not a mountain which has been thrust up by convulsive agencies, nor yet a remnant of a partially

eroded plateau, but a glacial deposit, hundreds of feet in height, and many miles in extent.'

Passengers by train from New York to Philadelphia might determine, within a few feet, as they traverse New Jersey, the limit of ancient ice-extension, so sharp is the contrast between the Brobdignagian rubbish-heaps to the north, and the flat, sandy plains to the south. At certain spots 'the transition is almost as clearly marked as that 'between land and water.' On the plateau of Pocono Mountain, two thousand feet above the sea, a Pennsylvanian extension of the Catskills,

'a low range of hills, seventy-five or a hundred feet in height, is literally formed of boulders, among which may readily be recognised those of granitic origin, wrenched from ledges hundreds of miles to the north, and transported hither across the valley of the Mohawk or over the broad expanse of Lake Ontario. Nicely ensconced within their wooded shores there are here also the numerous lakelets so often found occupying kettle holes, and forming the sources of streams which issue from the mountain-sides to water the valleys below. There are few more interesting regions in which to study an ancient terminal moraine than the plateau of Pocono Mountain.' ('Ice Age,' p. 133.)

Further west, however, the line of moraine diverges from the true glacial boundary. In other words, the drift-clad area, which is approximately contemporaneous with the greatest extension of the ice-sheet, spreads considerably further to the south than the ridged and undulating barrier marking, it is supposed, the front of a second advance. This latter has been followed for three thousand miles right up to the Rocky Mountains. It is a confused billowy formation, belting the continent in wide loops, axially disposed along the great river-valleys.* Coinciding with the drift-edge, as we have seen, in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, its independent interior meanderings carry it across Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, and so north-west into the Dominion of Canada. The outer glacial boundary meanwhile takes a generally south-westerly course, dipping in Illinois below the thirty-eighth parallel; then accompanies the Mississippi from Grand Tower to St. Louis, and departs little from the Missouri until the Rockies are encountered. The abundance with which ice-carried detritus strews the Western States is astonishing. Wholly composed of drift-material, the 'Missouri côteau' alone is of dimensions to accommodate more than one European nationality; and

* Chamberlin, 'American Journal of Science,' vol. cxxiv. p. 93.

stone-masses of extraneous origin are met with up to elevations of 4,200 feet above sea-level, near the base of the Rocky Mountains.

'All over northern Missouri,' Dr. Wright says, 'the whole of Iowa and eastern Dakota, boulders of large size are of frequent occurrence. In some places they completely cover the ground, especially in the lines of the great moraines. Even west of the Missouri, for thirty miles beyond Fort Yates, gigantic boulders are so abundant as to be prominent features in the landscape. Further north is the same territory, and in Montana, they are reported as sometimes so thick that a person can walk for long distances upon them without touching the ground.' ('Ice Age,' p. 213.)

Since 'the glacial movement was everywhere at right angles to the glacial boundary,' the line of their transport must have been from the north-east.

'Many of them might well enough have come from the vicinity of Lake Superior, a distance of 100 or 500 miles, though possibly some of them originated in more limited outcrops of granite in northern Minnesota.

'In British America the transportation was outward from the Laurentian axis in every direction. From this axis boulders in immense quantities were carried from 600 to 700 miles westward and left on the flanks of the Rocky Mountains from 2,000 to 3,000 feet above their source. In Dr. George M. Dawson's report upon the extension of the Missouri coteau into the central region of North America, he estimated that nearly ninety-eight per cent. of this great accumulation between the Missouri and Saskatchewan rivers was from the Laurentian axis, some hundred miles to the east, and that, upon the fringe beyond the coteau, where there is a mingling of material brought down from the Rocky Mountains, there is for some distance as much as forty-eight per cent. of Laurentian material.'

On the Pacific coast general glaciation scarcely extends below Puget Sound, but the spread of local glaciers from the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevada, and the Coast Range has left conspicuous traces far to the south. Thus, in the famous National Park, the upper cañon of the Yellowstone was once filled with ice to a depth of 1,600 feet; the Yosemite Valley formed the bed of a glacier; frozen yet plastic floods poured down the flanks of the Alps of Utah, as well as from the San Juan summits, the peaks of Shasta and Hood, and through the valleys of the San Joaquin and Tuolumne rivers.

The gathering-ground of the great body of ice, however, lay to the north-east, between Hudson's Bay and the river Ottawa. Thither rock-striae in all parts of the continent mostly converge; and thence outward erratics have widely

wandered. The distinctive character of some of these has attracted particular attention to the route they came by. A mass of native copper, obviously not at home in Iowa, is believed to have started on a journey of 460 miles from the neighbourhood of Lake Superior; and gold from the same region has been found disseminated through the glacial *débris* of Ohio and Indiana. Boulders of red jasper conglomerate, found abundantly in Michigan and on the hills bordering the trough of the Ohio, are clearly traceable to a parent ledge north of Lake Huron, six hundred miles away from some of its scattered offspring. Granitic fragments from the far north, moreover, were carried in old times not only to the glacial limit in the west, but right over the Alleghanies into New England. Some needed powerful means of transport. The 'Ship Rock,' for instance, perched on a precipitous cliff bordering the coast of Massachusetts, weighs now about eleven hundred tons, and its detached members, each of fifty to seventy-five tons, strew the ground. It may well have originally equalled the weight attributed, in its palmy days, to a conglomerate boulder at Fall River; though it could scarcely have rivalled the magnitude of a mass of blue limestone near Drakestown, in New Jersey, which was worked as a quarry for years without a suspicion of its erratic nature.

The production of ground-moraine by the slow grinding of the ancient ice-sheet in North America was on a prodigious scale. Great part of the pulverised materials stripped from submerged land-surfaces must have been carried out to sea by sub-glacial streams, and so placed beyond reach of estimate or calculation. Yet what remained sufficed to clothe, in the United States and old Hudson's Bay Territory alone, an area nearly five times as wide as France with clayey deposits to a prevalent depth of several scores of feet. Over the three states of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, the drift lies, on an average, according to Professor Claypole, sixty-two feet thick; and in many parts of Ohio well-borings have been sunk hundreds of feet before reaching rocky strata. The attempt was, indeed, in one case abandoned after 530 feet of ice-made soil had been fruitlessly penetrated.

'The mantle of drift,' Dr. Wright states, 'that conceals the rocks in central Minnesota is estimated to be between 100 and 200 feet deep. In the Red River region to the north, and over a wide belt stretching many hundred miles along the flanks of the Rocky Mountains, in the Dominion of Canada, the depth is equally great. In the upper valley of the South Saskatchewan, at an elevation of about 1,000 feet above

the sea, and from 600 to 700 miles west of the Laurentian axis, from which much of the glaciated material came, Mr. McConnell reports sections of till 125 feet deep.' ('Ice Age,' p. 228.)

From an agricultural point of view, the results are highly satisfactory. The inexhaustible fertility of the Far West is an endowment from vanished glaciers. Their *moraine profonde* nourishes the waving harvests of Minnesota, and gives for every grain of wheat sown in its bosom a hundred-fold return,* at some sacrifice, it must be admitted, of picturesqueness. The 'face without features' of that prolific country is expressive only of obliteration. Whatever romantic inequalities it may once have possessed are buried deep down beneath a dense coating of rich loam.

The glacial garment of North America must, as Professor Dana observes,† have been of radiant whiteness, since it enveloped and overlay all sources of spot or stain. From New England to the Mississippi, not a peak protruded above its unsullied surface save those of the White Mountains, and they were doubtless capped with snow. The dirty work in progress, and the results show its colossal amount, was carried on out of sight in the basement-story of its lofty structure. Even the business of boulder-transport proceeded most likely, in large measure, sub-glacially.

The heights to which the ice-flood rose are frequently self-registered on the mountains which once breasted its flow. They serve, in Dr. Wright's phrase, as 'glaciometers.' Thus it has been learned that the ice was a mile thick in New England, and a couple of thousand feet in Pennsylvania. And these are minimum estimates. Completely overtopping the summit of Mount Desert Island, it fronted the ocean, on the coast of Maine, in a wall much more than fifteen hundred feet high.

'Even Mount Washington, in New Hampshire, was either wholly enveloped by the ice-current, or if a pinnacle projected above the glacier, it could have been no more than 300 or 400 feet higher, Professor Hitchcock having found transported boulders to within that distance of the summit. The ice-current passed over the Green Mountains, where they are from 3,000 to 5,000 feet in height, in a course diagonal to that of their general direction, showing that such a mountain-chain made scarcely more of a ripple in the moving mass than a sunken log would make in a shallow river.' ('Ice Age,' p. 166.)

* The average production of wheat is about fourteen bushels to the acre in the glaciated, nine in the unglaciated, parts of Ohio. Wright, 'American Journal of Science,' vol. cxxvi. p. 49.

† Manual of Geology, p. 536, 3rd edition.

Similarly, Mr. J. C. Branner concludes, from personal study on the spot, that the ice flowed over the mountainous region of north-east Pennsylvania in utter disregard of its topographical features.* This naturally implies profound submergence. How profound, we can only try to conceive with the help of Agassiz's rule † that no glacier can cross a ridge higher than two-thirds of its own thickness. A generalisation, indeed, derived from the glacial rivulets of the Alps cannot safely be applied to the glacial sea of North America; but we may be sure, at any rate, that mountains were not sunk out of sight in a flood nearly flush with their summits.

But the greatest depth of ice lay far to the north of New England, in the Canadian highlands. There was the nucleus of the whole formation; thence must have come the gravitational *vis à tergo* that provided means of transport to distances of seven hundred miles outward. According to the best authorised calculation, based on the assumption of a continuous slope equal to that of the Jakobshavn glacier, or of 45 feet to the mile, the ice stream at its origin was 30,000 feet thick. But the result has scarcely more than an illustrative value. Until the dynamics of solidified water are better understood, much confidence cannot be placed in attempts to estimate the 'head of ice' requisite to produce a given extent of glaciation.

The effectiveness of ice as an eroding agency has often been unduly enhanced, and as often unduly decried. But the Glacial Epoch needs no epitaph beyond that of Wren in St. Paul's—*Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*. Whole States clothed with the stripped-off rock-covering of sister States, groovings six to eight feet deep in solid strata, lakes and fiords excavated or enlarged, attest no mean activity. Deeply indented coast lines are characteristic of anciently glaciated countries. Patent examples are to be seen in Norway, Scotland, Ireland, Greenland, and Alaska. Inland sheets of water, too, of all sizes and aspects, appear, for some imperfectly understood reason, to be the natural successors of removed ice sheets. Yet the theory of glacial lake-making, first advanced by the late Sir A. C. Ramsay in 1862,‡ is only true within carefully defined limits. That Scottish tarns and Welsh llynys are products of glacial erosion no one

* American Journal of Science, vol. cxxii. p. 366.

† Communicated verbally to Professor Lesley.

‡ Quart. Jour. Geol. Society, vol. xviii. p. 186.

denies.* But Loch Lomond is essentially a tarn, or scooped-out rock basin, nor has the Lake of Geneva been shown to be of a different nature. The glacial origin, however, of the great Swiss lakes is strenuously denied, and its discussion forms no part of our present subject. In the Sierra Nevada, on the other hand, pools of the Loch Doon type abound, and leave no doubt as to the manner of their creation.

'They frequently occur,' Mr. I. C. Russell states, in his valuable 'Report' on the 'Quaternary History of Mono Valley,'† 'at the lower limit of a steep slope, which is polished and grooved, and bears every indication of having been abraded by glacial action. In such cases the slope and direction of the furrows show that ice once descended into the basin. On examining the opposite portion of the rim of the depression, glacial markings of the same character will be found. The proof is thus positive that ice once descended into the depressions now filled with water, and emerged from them again to continue its course. As there is no other agent known capable of eroding hollows in solid rock having the character of the basins observed in the high Sierras, it seems evident that the theory of the formation of rock-basins proposed by A. C. Ramsay from evidence obtained in Scotland and Switzerland, is substantially correct, and furnishes the true explanation of the examples before us. The manner in which the power of moving ice is directed so as to erode depressions may be open to discussion, but the conclusion that rock-basins are a result of glacial action is now too strongly supported by facts to be questioned.'

'Kettle-hole' lakes are indirectly of glacial construction. They occupy depressions in ancient moraines, and have been, in many cases, put out of hand, so to speak, in a defective condition, leaking at the edges, and running dry in summer. Others have accumulated peat, and so gained the undeserved reputation of unfathomable depth.

'It is thus,' Dr. Wright says, 'that nearly all the peat-bogs of New England and the North-West have originated. In numerous cases the peat forms a rim about the edge at the water-level, while in the deeper portion the surface of the clear water looks up from the shadows, or reflects the sunshine like the pupil of a gigantic eye. The lakes and bogs of Ireland present familiar examples of this class of glacial enclosures, while in this country one cannot easily run amiss of them, either in New England or in the North-West. The south-eastern portion of Massachusetts abounds in them in special degree. As before remarked, Plymouth county is little less than a ganglion of such glacial lakes with their enclosing deposits, Plymouth township

* W. M. Davies, *Proceedings Boston Society of Nat. History*, vol. xxii. p. 50.

† Quoted by Dr. Wright, 'Ice Age,' p. 237.

alone being reported to have three hundred and sixty. They appear all along the line of the terminal moraine, often capping its very summit in the western portion of Long Island, even within the limits of the city of Brooklyn.' ('Ice Age,' p. 320.)

'Lakes of obstruction,' as they have been called, owe their existence to a 'glacial dam,' composed either of actual ice or of ice-borne *débris*. The tourist-haunted Märjelen See, to take an obvious example, has its outlet barred, not always effectually, by the Great Aletsch glacier. American counterparts to it, however, are extinct. One, according to Dr. Wright's plausible theory, was supplied from no less copious a source than the tumultuous Ohio. That this river was long either bridged or blocked by the ice-flow from the north is certain.* Which alternative is true can only be definitively ascertained through the discovery of the probably now deep-buried channel across the Kentucky hills cut for themselves by the diverted waters. That they were really ponded back in the way supposed seems to be asserted by the occurrence of high terraces along the tributary streams of the Ohio, just at the calculated level of the presumed ancient lake. Some of these are indeed stated to be of fluvial origin, yet a residuum may be accepted as undoubtedly lacustrine. The ice dam at Cincinnati, to produce the effects required of it, must have stood 550 feet high, and borne a pressure of 250 pounds to the square inch.

The fifty miles of thickness attributed to it, however, would have rendered it perhaps for centuries impregnable by floods. The sinuous reach of slack water it created had an area, according to authoritative estimates, of 20,000 square miles. Nearly 1,000 miles in length, it extended, on one side, to Grafton in Western Virginia, on the other, to Oil City in Pennsylvania, and covered the site of Pittsburg to a depth of 300 feet. The eventual breaking of such a barrier can hardly have been tranquilly accomplished. When the retreat of the ice set in, and its waste was no longer compensated, its level gradually fell below that of the temporary outflow of the Ohio through Kentucky.

'The waters then,' in Professor Clapole's words,† 'took their course over the dam, and the spectacle of a great ice-cascade, or of long ice-rapids, was exhibited at Cincinnati. This cataract, or these rapids, must have been several hundred feet high. Down these cliffs or this slope the water dashed, melting its own channel, and breaking up the

* Chamberlin, Bulletin U.S. Geol. Survey, No. 58, 1890, p. 17

† Quoted by Dr. Wright, 'Ice Age,' p. 347.

foundations of its own dam. With the depression of the dam the level of the lake also fell. Possibly the change was gradual, and the dam and the lake went gently down together. Possibly, but not probably, this was the case. Far more likely is it that the melting was rapid, and that it sapped the strength of the dam faster than it lowered the water. This will be more probable if we consider the immense area to be drained. The catastrophe was then inevitable—the dam broke, and all the accumulated water of Lake Ohio was poured through the gap. Days or even weeks must have passed before it was all gone, but at last its bed was dry. The upper Ohio valley was free from water, and Lake Ohio had passed away.^{*}

Lake Agassiz,* the last great body of water banked up by the retiring glacier, appears to have emptied by instalments, three raised beaches, the highest 85 feet above the present valley-level, marking the successive stages of its decline. At its maximum, it extended 600 miles along the basin of the Red River south-west from Lake Winnipeg, and showed a wider surface than that of all the great Laurentian Lakes together. The present Red and Rainy Lakes, and the Lake of the Woods, are in fact fitted into small corners of its former area. Nor was its existence ephemeral. The quantity of fine silt left behind by them proves that its waters were slow to find their final exit by Nelson River into Hudson's Bay. Dr. Wright mentions that 'in repeated instances wells have been driven from 100 to 200 feet without reaching the bottom of the deposit, and it is spread over many thousands of square miles. Such,' he adds, 'is the heritage which the great glacier of the Ice Age left as its parting gift to ensure the permanent prosperity of northern Minnesota and Dakota, and of the eastern half of Manitoba.'

The formation of Lake Agassiz was only one characteristic incident among many results from a single cause. This was the barrage, by the partially withdrawn ice rampart, of the whole northern drainage of the continent. All the old channels had their issues closed; the pent-up waters accumulated; and at last, brimming over across the watershed, flowed south. The Minnesota is now an inconsiderable stream threading its hesitating way along a valley miles too wide for it. But that almost empty receptacle was far from superfluously large when it conducted the flood of the Red River of the North and the overflow of Lake Agassiz to a junction with the Mississippi, and so on to the Gulf of

* So designated by its diligent explorer, Mr. Warren Upham.

052 EDI
vol. 175 (P)

1892.

The Ice Age in North America.

815

Mexico. The Great Lakes also, during the occupation by ice of the St. Lawrence Valley, must certainly have sent their spare supplies southward. But their history is exceedingly complicated. Professor J. W. Spencer,* who has devoted ten years to its elucidation, affirms that 'the lake basins are merely closed-up portions of the ancient St. Lawrence Valley and its tributaries,' and although this entire region was overwhelmed to an immense depth by the continental glacier, he denies to it any share in the work of excavation. Nevertheless Professor Newberry,† as the outcome on his side also of prolonged local study, concludes glacial erosion to have been essentially concerned. Both agree, however, that the Great Lakes existed in Tertiary times only as an extensive river system, and in their present shape, sizes, and mutual connexions, are post-glacial. It is practically certain, besides, that the ice-blockade while it lasted raised their waters to the level of the superannuated shore lines, now hundreds of feet above their surfaces, and that they found on its removal many of their ancient channels rendered impracticable through the accumulation of drift. And impracticable they have remained, choked and buried, and scarcely to be discovered by curious inquiry. New outlets had accordingly to be opened, and one of them was the Niagara River. It was then, at the definitive close of the Glacial Epoch in the United States, that the thunder of the Falls began to resound through the fresh springing forests on the neck of land separating Erie from Ontario. They were not, however, then at Goat Island, but at Queenston, seven miles further down, where a limestone escarpment lifts its sheer height of 200 feet from the plain. Here the Niagara took its first plunge, and began gnawing its patient way backward to the actual site of the world-renowned cataract. The resulting gorge has been described as 'the largest single piece of post-glacial erosion this side of the Mississippi.‡' That it is mainly post-glacial, and has been executed at an approximately uniform rate, gives it a special interest and importance. The Falls of Niagara indeed constitute in themselves, in Dr. Wright's apt phrase, 'a glacial chronometer.'

Much trouble has been bestowed upon its accurate rating ;

* Quart. Jour. Geol. Society, 1890, p. 523 ; Geological Magazine, 1890, p. 281.

† Proceedings Amer. Phil. Society, vol. xx. p. 91.

‡ W. M. Davis, American Journal of Science, cxxviii. p. 124.

Marshall University Public Library

7601

Dr. 24.7.75

and repeated trigonometrical surveys since 1842 afford so sure a basis for calculation that serious error in estimating, from the amount of work done, the time consumed in doing it, need not longer be apprehended. The result is thus stated by our author :—

‘The length of the front of the Horseshoe Fall is 2,300 feet. Between 1842 and 1875 four and a quarter acres of rock were worn away by the recession of the Falls. Between 1875 and 1886 a little over one acre and a third disappeared in a similar manner, making in all, from 1842 to 1886, about five and a half acres removed, and giving an annual rate of recession of about two feet and a half per year for the last forty-five years. But in the central part of the curve, where the water is deepest, the Horseshoe Fall retreated between 200 and 275 feet in the eleven years between 1875 and 1886.’ (*Ice Age*, p. 456.)

The average rate of recession arrived at through careful weighing of these and other analogous facts is five feet per annum, or nearly a mile in a thousand years. Hence from seven to eight thousand years have elapsed since the foam of Niagara rose through the air at Queenston; and the interval might even be shortened by taking into account some evidences of pre-glacial erosion by a local stream, making it probable that from the Whirlpool downward the cutting of the gorge proceeded more rapidly than it does now. The date of the close of the Glacial Epoch in the United States can scarcely then be placed earlier than 6000 B.C. For it was, we repeat, the withdrawal of the ice that set the chronometer of the Falls going.

Their testimony does not stand alone. The prevalence of waterfalls and gorges sharply distinguishes some parts of the States, once ice-occupied, from adjacent unglaciated tracts. Now this prevalence marks the readjustment through drift deposition of the local drainage system. For deep dells, chasms, and cascades are, geologically speaking, of a transitory nature. They belong to recently established water channels; streams and rivers with indefinite leisure seldom failing to attain the eventual status of a serene flow through open valleys. The annulment of their early labours towards this end has, in many cases, been ascertained by the detection of their ancient beds, profoundly interred beneath the new glacial soil; and it has thus been found possible to put together a good part of the Tertiary fluviatile map of the American continent.

The course of the Mississippi, as traced upon it, shows one slight but significant deviation from its present course. Pre-glacially, it followed a wide bend from Minneapolis to Fort

Snelling; now it flows straight across the intervening eight miles to its junction with the Minnesota. On its way it leaps the Falls of St. Anthony, and the rate of their retreat since 1680, exactly determined from the observation of Father Hennequin, proves them to be about 8,300 years old. This second glacial timepiece, accordingly, which, owing to its more southerly position, was started earlier than the first, gives substantially the same reading. It has been stopped. The Falls of St. Anthony are now fixed artificially at Minneapolis.

The ravines and cascades of Ohio, studied by Dr. Wright, agree with the two great Falls in asserting a comparatively recent overthrow of the ice régime. The unworn condition of glacial deposits, the sharpness of glacial groovings, above all, the insignificant progress made with the silting up of glacial lakes, testify as well, and in some cases quite definitely, to a short lapse of time.

‘We do not,’ remarks our author, ‘bring railing accusations against those who, from astronomical considerations, confidently speak of the close of the Glacial period as an event which occurred scores of thousands of years ago; but it is important to know what other beliefs that long chronology carries with it. If anyone chooses to believe that kettle-holes can stand one hundred thousand years, and fill up only 24 feet from the apex of the inverted cone, he must run the risk of being considered credulous.’ (*Ice Age*, p. 171.)

But if the Ice Age in America terminated—as we seem bound to admit—less than ten thousand years ago, so, beyond question, did the Ice Age in Europe. There is no possibility of separating the course of glacial events in each continent. The points of agreement are too many; the phenomena too nearly identical in themselves and in their sequence. Elevation and depression of continents, the formation, retreat, and second advance of the ice sheet, the accompaniment of its melting by tremendous floods, the extermination of the same varieties of animals, the appearance and obliteration of Palæolithic man, all preserved identical mutual relations in the Old and New Worlds. Possibly then, over the whole earth, certainly over the northern hemisphere, the phases of climate, so strangely but legibly recorded, prevailed simultaneously. This, indeed, is only what might have been expected from the general unity of geological history.

During the long Tertiary epoch, when opossums disported themselves on the site of Paris, and mastodons tramped along the valley of the Thames, the earth was in the

throes of mountain-making. The Alps, the Himalayas, the Alleghanies, the Andes, attest the power of her activity in those days. At their termination, our continents stood greatly higher than they do now; and this aided their glaciation, although it does not fully account for it. But as they became loaded with ice, Europe and America gradually, and we may venture to say contemporaneously, sank.* This was inevitable. Owing to the extreme heat and pressure prevailing in its interior, the earth is an eminently elastic body. Its surface actually bulges in or out with a very slight increase or decrease of the load upon it. But the great ice sheet formed no such visionary burden as Atlas bore upon his broad shoulders. Mr. Warren Upham estimates that an area of about 4,000,000 square miles in North America and another of about 2,000,000 square miles in Europe 'were covered by ice sheets, which in their maximum extent had probably an average thickness of a half or two-thirds of a mile, or perhaps even of one mile.'† The weight, however, of a column of ice half a mile high, is, in round numbers, 1,100 pounds to the square inch, and there are more than four thousand million square inches in a square mile. And the whole of this enormous mass being extracted from the ocean, its differential effect in producing changes of level was doubled. The ice-cumbered land accordingly went down, like an overladen ship, until it was awash with the waves, and sea-shells were deposited along coast fringes above the drift. Then, as the ice melted, recovery ensued; and how closely it followed upon relief of pressure is shown by the tilt to the north of the once horizontal raised beaches of Lake Agassiz.

On both sides of the Atlantic equally, the intercalation of fossilised forests bears authentic witness to the sweeping over the land of two great waves of ice invasion. The trees manifestly grew where the glaciers had been; again the glaciers crept forward to constitute themselves the sepulchres of the trees. The second advance, however, fell short of the first, and succeeded it at an unknown interval of time. Opinions are much divided as to its true significance. Dr. Wright inclines to connect the 'forest beds' with merely partial oscillations of the ice front. The Glacial

* Mr. Jamieson first perceived in 1865 the necessary connexion of submergence with ice-loading. Cf. *Geol. Mag.* vol. ix. p. 403, and O. Fisher, *ibid.* p. 526.

† Wright's 'Ice Age,' App. p. 579.

Epoch is, in his view, one and indivisible: its termination was definitive; it included minor fluctuations of climate, just as the flowing and ebbing tides embrace evanescent disturbances of opposite tendency. And he adverts with emphasis to the circumstance that the interposed peat layers 'do not mark a warm climate, but a climate much 'colder than the present.' They are the product, in fact, of 'such a vegetation as would naturally flourish near the 'ice margin. The buried forests of southern Ohio,' he adds, 'have a striking resemblance to those we described in 'Glacier Bay, Alaska,' in which hardy coniferous trees predominate. ('Ice Age,' p. 482.) But a genuine 'interglacial period' could only result from persistently mild conditions. Nevertheless, the duplication of the ice occupancy, since it occurred to about the same extent, and with the same symptoms, both in Europe and America, had plainly a general cause; and should vegetable remains sandwiched in drift be discovered so far up to the north as Lake Winnipeg, it will be difficult to gainsay Professor Chamberlin's opinion that the entire ice sheet was removed and restored while the embedded pines and red cedars of Ohio and Indiana flourished at leisure.

The point has an important bearing upon the vexed question of the antiquity of man. For Palæolithic implements have been found in various parts of the United States—along the Delaware Valley, at Madisonville, Ohio, at Little Falls, Minnesota, and elsewhere—embedded in 'glacial gravel,' a heterogeneous deposit of clay and stones, flung down in massive embankments by the raging floods let loose during the break-up of the secular frost. One of these tool-bearing strata, however (at Claymont, Delaware), is supposed to have originated during the melting of the first ice sheet, before the buried forests of Ohio had begun to spring at its margin. They are accordingly referred, by the advocates of a long inter-glacial period, to an epoch thousands of years anterior to that of the similar accumulations at Trenton and Little Falls. But there is no archæological evidence of the lapse of any such interval. The Quartz hammers or chisels of Little Falls, and the chert scrapers from Madisonville, are no less rudely chipped than the argillite 'arrow heads' from the railway cutting at Claymont, the far greater presumed antiquity of the last notwithstanding. The constructors of all, indeed, stood so undeniably on the same level of barbarism that it is difficult to conceive that a wide gulf of time separated them.

Hunting and fishing were doubtless the chief employments of those primeval generations. They shared what forest shelter the glaciers left them with the mastodon, the bison, the moose, and the musk-ox; reindeer browsed on the mossy slopes; walrus lay in herds on the field-ice along the seashore. Most of these animals were fugitives from the frozen North, whither they returned with the slow return of warmth; but the camel, hippopotamus, tapir, rhinoceros, mammoth, mastodon, and horse did not survive the crisis of climate in North America.

‘Their complete extermination,’ as Dr. Wright truly says, ‘is one of the most startling facts in geology. But, as Darwin has so well shown, the effects of a glacial advance are by no means limited to the regions directly reached by the ice. In pushing southward the plant and animals of the northern part of the continent, the struggle for life in the more crowded quarters of the decreasing congenial portions of the country became more and more intense, and thus doubtless was brought about much of the extinction of species which the geologists have to record as having taken place in the early part of the quaternary period.’ (‘Ice Age,’ p. 568.)

The human race seems to have shared the same fate; for it is a mere unsupported conjecture that the modern Esquimaux are direct descendants of the antediluvians of the Delaware Valley. Indications, on the contrary, abound that in Europe and America Palæolithic man succumbed to post-glacial floods. The relics of the Somme and Little Elk alike commemorate the rude existence of generations that met their doom when ‘waters prevailed beyond measure upon the earth.’ The chipped flint implement-makers perished with their contemporaries, the mammoth, the woolly rhinoceros, and the sabre-toothed tiger, and left the globe to be repopled by the polished stone-working or Neolithic progenitors of its actual inhabitants. The gap between the two races is conspicuous, and has not yet been archæologically bridged. A catastrophe is indicated; and a catastrophe by water. This is the conclusion of science; how singularly it harmonises with the Biblical narrative it is almost superfluous to point out.

The Ice Age has proved a hard nut for speculation to crack. One explanatory contrivance after another has been tried without success. An astronomical theory, skilfully elaborated by the late Dr. Croll, was at first favourably received by nonplussed geologists. Meteorologists, however, with something of the *suave mari magno* sense of exemption from agitating perplexities, were adversely critical; and their

objections have of late been reinforced by the slowly garnered facts of glacial chronology. But the reluctantly discarded hypothesis has found an able advocate in Sir Robert Ball, the Astronomer Royal for Ireland.

The well-known drift of that hypothesis was to exhibit the former glaciation of a great part of the northern as a simple exaggeration of the conditions now prevailing in the southern hemisphere. There, in consequence of the ellipticity of the earth's orbit, together with the coincidence of its aphelion passage with the southern winter solstice, the colder is seven days longer than the hotter season of the year; while, in addition, the mid-winter sun is three million miles more distant than the mid-summer sun. These adverse circumstances are precisely reversed in our quarter of the world. The northern winter is modified by the vicinity of the sun, and is seven days shorter than the northern summer. Precession of the equinoxes, however, combines with the tardy shifting of the earth's orbital major axis to render these mutual relations periodical in about twenty-one thousand years. Our present advantages were enjoyed 10,500 years ago by the southern hemisphere, and the state of things now existing is a restoration of that which prevailed twice as far back in time. And perfectly similar oscillations have doubtless been in progress throughout all the geological ages. Moreover, the changes brought about by them were not always so insignificant as they are now. The eccentricity of the earth's path upon which they depend slowly waxes and wanes; it has been declining towards a minimum for a quarter of a million of years; it ceased to be at all considerable eighty thousand years ago.

The question is a very complex one as to whether the unequal distribution of heat produced by aphelion winters in a markedly oval orbit may be competent to give rise to glacial epochs. The quantity of available heat is not subject to variation. In describing any two right angles of her annual round, the earth receives from the sun the same absolute amount of heat, even though she be much farther away from him on one side of the line of equinoxes than on the other. But quicker travelling exactly neutralises increased vicinity. Constant likewise is the proportionate allotment of this sum total between the northern and southern hemispheres. It is, in fact, determined by the sensibly constant inclination of the earth's axis of rotation. These shares, as Sir Robert Ball pointed out at the Cardiff meeting last autumn of the British Association, are in the

ratio of 37 to 63. That is to say, the winter hemisphere receives, from equinox to equinox, 37 per cent., the summer hemisphere 63 per cent., of the total radiation falling upon the earth. But, with winter in aphelion, the shorter supply is spread over the longer time; and the heat famine thence resulting, when the long cold season extended—as it did a couple of hundred thousand years ago—to close upon two hundred days, has been only now, by the Irish Astronomer Royal, duly estimated and emphasised. It is true that the corresponding summers were torrid, if brief; but intensity of heat imperfectly compensates for duration of cold. Conceivably, then, glaciers might have grown, under conditions of high eccentricity and aphelion winters, to the portentous extent vouched for by the erratic blocks of Europe and the United States. From this point of view, ‘The Cause of an Ice Age’ is, by the authority just named, popularly and attractively expounded in the opening volume of the ‘Modern Science’ series.

Yet American geologists are inexorable in their *non possumus*. For the high eccentricity theory requires the Ice Age to be put back in time about ten times farther than the facts of erosion will allow it to go. No one pretends that, while the earth’s orbit was of its actual nearly circular shape, winter in aphelion could bring about extensive ice-deposits in medium latitudes. That state of things is exemplified at this day in the southern hemisphere. The seasons there, however, far from exhibiting the expected contrasts, are more uniform than in our region of the globe; and although temperatures range lower in extra-tropical latitudes south than north of the line, the disparity seems explicable from geographical considerations, and is besides amply compensated by an excess of southern tropical heat. It is at any rate certain that southern lands are now less and not more ice-laden than formerly. The New Zealand glaciers, for instance, have greatly shrunk from their dimensions at an epoch probably not more remote than that at which the Rhone glacier invaded the plain of Lyons. Their past extension was then independent of winter in aphelion.

Dr. Croll’s theory further involves the regular recurrence, while high eccentricity lasted, of glacial epochs at intervals of twenty-one thousand years, each separated from the next by a genial period representing a cycle of winters in perihelion. No such continuous vicissitudes, however, can be shown to have actually affected either hemisphere. Nor was the real ice-invasion conducted upon the plan he supposed. A polar

ice-cap, closing down over temperate zones, could not have left Siberia uncovered; yet Siberia was never noticeably glaciated. Abundant evidence, on the other hand, is forthcoming that Europe and America created and maintained their own glaciers. Scandinavia and the Canadian Highlands were their respective rendezvous. Arctic ice could only have moved southward; but, in the Hudson's Bay Territory, the general direction of boulder-transport was towards the north. The ice, in other words, radiated from an interiorly situated centre of motion and supply.

Must, then, this tempting hypothesis be foregone? It would appear so; nor are we able to provide a satisfactory substitute. Rational speculation is no longer authorised to stray along 'the old, forbidden trail,' as Professor Chamberlin calls it, of a wandering pole; and the expedient would be inadequate, even if it were admissible. The diversion of the Gulf stream might be practicable, but would not account for the simultaneous glaciation of two continents; and any admissible changes in the distribution of land and water are mere toys compared with the magnitude of the phenomenon that has to be dealt with. A temporarily cooled sun combines the disadvantages of being unwarrantable and unavailing, heavy snow-fall implying rapid evaporation, hence powerful sun-heat. Ample stores of water-vapour, then, must have been supplied from the tropics; while to induce their condensation in the form of snow in higher latitudes, frigid conditions must have reigned over wide tracts of elevated land. Now the great Tertiary uplift raised the old and new continents to many hundred, in some places to two or three thousand, feet above their actual level, and this in itself lowered their mean temperature in the proportion of about three degrees Fahrenheit to one thousand feet. But, according to Professor Bonney's purposely minimised estimate,* the reduction should have amounted to 16° in America, and to 18° or 20° in Europe. To produce glaciers on the old scale, the climate of Spitzbergen should be brought to Lucerne, and the climate of Fredericksaab to Boston. And this in regions which had enjoyed, pre-glacially, a semi-tropical climate!

To recapitulate. The conditions of extensive glaciation are three: copious precipitation, continental elevation, and a low mean temperature. The operations of evaporation and

* 'Did Geographical Changes cause the Glacial Epoch?' *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1891.

condensation must be conducted with particular vigour. The sun, accordingly, must be in good working order, and enormous volumes of the aqueous vapour stolen by his rays from tropical seas must be collected on mountain-uplands in the form of snow. This, at a sufficient altitude, might, in any climate, be effected; but the maintenance of the snow, and its conversion into an ice-sheet, demands the conjoint agency of lowland cold. To account for such lowland cold is the main problem, a satisfactory solution of which should include a rationale of Tertiary arctic heat as due to an opposite swing of the same pendulum of change. Now the astronomical is unquestionably the most plausible explanation yet offered of these vicissitudes. Yet we seem obliged to reject it. The case on the other side is too strong to be dismissed. In the first place, the conditions postulated by the view in question were assuredly present during some part of the long Tertiary age, without any corresponding result. Winter in aphelion must frequently have been combined with high eccentricity while the Alps and Andes rose above their present altitudes, and the countless series of Eocene, Miocene, and Pliocene beds were being laid down; yet the luxuriant vegetation of northern plains was not even in Spitzbergen or Greenland interrupted by the spread of an ice-sheet. Moreover, the recent date now assigned, on apparently incontrovertible grounds, to the only Ice Age with which we have any positive acquaintance, makes it impossible to connect it with the slow progress of astronomical change. Until these objections are satisfactorily disposed of, the eccentricity theory can only be regarded as out of court. It possesses considerable merits, but seems to lack the supreme recommendation of truth. And there is unfortunately nothing to fall back upon. All other attempted explanations of 'the great glacial accident of prehistoric time' strike an unprejudiced mind as hopelessly inadequate. As regards the meteorology of the past, we are accordingly left, in Professor Chamberlin's words, 'with the old stock of hypotheses on hand, but all badly damaged by the deluge of recent facts.' The riddle remains to be read.

ART. II.—1. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites.* By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., LL.D. Edinburgh: 1889.

2. *Kirship and Marriage in Early Arabia.* By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge: 1885.

THE views expressed in the works above specified are held by a good many scholars at home and abroad, and have found acceptance with a certain class of thinkers and readers. The facts on which they are founded are not as a rule of recent discovery, but have long been known to all who have studied such subjects. It is in the method of dealing with such facts, and in the very definite theories whereby it is attempted to explain them, that this literary school is peculiar. The object of the present review is neither to depreciate the learning and scholarship of those who are to be considered, nor to dispute the facts contained in ancient literature and on monuments, but to consider how far the theories are likely to have a permanent value, and to become generally accepted as affording true explanations.

Dr. Robertson Smith is widely known as a Biblical scholar, and as a student of Arab literature of the earliest period; and although his own acquaintance with Eastern life, and with the habits of thought of Orientals, is slight, his reading in his own lines of study is extensive, and his industry great. His mind is of the receptive rather than of the original order, and in Biblical criticism he is the disciple of Wellhausen, in philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and in social archæology of J. F. McLennan. In an age when literary honesty is not too common it is to his credit that he faithfully quotes his authorities on every page. He has, as he reminds us, suffered for his beliefs, and this again gives strength to his voice; but the question still remains how far his enthusiasm has obscured his judgement, and in what degree he has made the best use of the best extant materials in forming his conclusions. The field which he enters is wide, and requires wide as well as deep study, and there are departments into which he has never specially entered, which may be as important, or even more so, than those with which he is familiar. It cannot be said that the writers with whom he most closely agrees have been generally received as leaders of undisputed authority. Wellhausen's theory as to the mode and date of construction of the Old Testament is remarkable rather for its novelty than for its soundness. Those portions of

Genesis which former scholars regarded as oldest he regards as the most recent, in spite of their archaic character and language, and this reversal of critical conclusions has mainly served to show the unsatisfactory nature of purely literary criticism. The theory of the origin of religion, which is connected with the name of Herbert Spencer, has often been called in question, both by anthropologists and also by Oriental antiquaries. It rests mainly on selected quotations from travellers' accounts of savage custom, and there is no subject on which it is more difficult to discover and understand the real thoughts of savages, than in those matters which are connected with their beliefs. In the same manner, the views of McLennan as to polyandry have been traversed, by those who are familiar with the polyandrous tribes of India, as not according with the real facts of their social life. It is not, therefore, on account of prejudice in favour of former beliefs that hesitation may be felt in accepting the peculiar views about to be considered, as being the final outcome of educated inquiry into the facts.

The subject to be considered is that of the gradual social and religious progress of Semitic races--that is, of the various kindred stocks of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia, a small but very distinct Asiatic group of nationalities, with languages of a single and distinct character; and the attempt to form some judgement as to the earliest conditions of custom and belief, out of which their civilisation grew. As in every other branch of natural science, it is important to remember from the outset that growth was not unaccompanied by decay, and that progress was not constant nor free from relapse. If by 'evolution' is meant the gradual advance in power and perfection, the student is but half studying his subject if he neglects to take into account the results of disintegration also. In language it is generally admitted that words and dialects not only multiply and advance, but also change through decay. In the study of race it is well known that peoples once civilised have sunk again into a barbarous condition, that peoples who under favourable conditions have grown stalwart and tall may again become dwarfed by starvation and misery. In religion the highest may be followed by the lowest, and noble teachings may be overgrown by the abuses of superstition. The rock which was formed in the course of ages from the sands crumbles to sand again, as great states also decay and fall. If we assume that the most barbarous customs and beliefs

are of necessity the most primitive, we approach our subject from a prejudiced point of view, and the study which is desirable is not that of the 'evolution' of faiths, but of their growth and decay, and of their contemporary aspects, in the highest and lowest extremes of a nation's belief.

Dr. Robertson Smith, however, holds that the best key to the study is to be found in the beliefs of Arabia, and this for two reasons: first, that they are more 'primitive;' and secondly, that they were less influenced by foreign systems—Arabia being, in his opinion, the home of the original stock, and the region where other races had little or no influence. These postulates it appears, however, legitimate to dispute, and the objections which he raises to the superior claims of Assyrian and Babylonian over Arab antiquities are perhaps less forcible than those which may be stated against the study in which he is mainly interested. It is true that the ancient Semitic race in Mesopotamia was, as he supposes, strongly influenced by the civilisation of another and non-Semitic people, but the date to which our information is carried back is, in this case, some two thousand years earlier than that to which Arab antiquities can be carried. We know next to nothing of ancient Arabia, for the inscriptions of Yemen do not reach back much beyond the Christian era, and in other parts of the peninsula the oldest remains give clear evidence of Assyrian influence; while as regards literature we are forced to depend on the Arab authors of the times following Muhammad's great reform. It cannot be said that we stand on secure ground in regarding as primitive the social conditions of Muhammad's time, or of those which immediately preceded his appearance. The Arabs had to a great extent become enervated, and their society vitiated, by centuries of successful trading. In the Roman times the prosperity of Yemen, and the luxury of its court, were remarkable, even in a luxurious age. Muhammad himself began life as a trader, and the Koran bears witness to the Persian, Jewish, and Christian influences with which he came in contact.

The towns, like Mecca and Medina, were full of Jewish traders, and the proportion of the country, and of its population, which was settled and engaged in commerce, was much larger than is popularly supposed. Even the nomadic tribes were thus in close contact with the civilisation of the age, much as they still are, and such association cannot have failed to influence their ideas. On account, therefore, of late date, and of social conditions, it appears that the

study of Arab superstition is not more likely to lead us to new and correct judgements than is that of the older Semitic stocks of Palestine, Phœnicia, and Chaldea.

It may indeed be doubted whether Dr. Robertson Smith has not over-estimated the purity of the Semitic races, in this and other parts of Western Asia, and their general independence of any foreign influence. The recent discovery of cuneiform letters at Tell Amarna has proved that in Syria, as early as 1600 *b.c.*, there was a non-Semitic as well as a Semitic population, and that Egyptians also had settled in the land. Our author himself admits that in the north the Hittites were probably non-Semitic, and the Bible clearly states that the Canaanites were not of the same race with the sons of Shem. In Assyria this foreign influence was strong, as well as in Babylonia, and the language from an early period was full of foreign words; but even Hebrew did not escape such influences, while in later times Persian, and Greek, and Latin words found their way into the speech of the Jews. As to Arabia, we are entirely ignorant of the early character of its population, though there are some reasons for conjecturing that it was not purely Semitic. That the Hebrews were in the early days, before their captivity, influenced by the customs and superstitions of the Canaanites, and of the Assyrians, is so clearly stated in the Old Testament as to need no demonstration. We are, therefore, confronted in this, as in so many other cases, with the usual difficulty in distinguishing the origin of each custom, belief, and even word, in sifting the various elements of language and population, and in estimating the results of the very ancient trading relations, which connected Babylonia and Assyria with Egypt and with the East—even as far as India—and which were only made possible by the use of the great highways which crossed the Hebrew and Phœnician lands. The problem is, therefore, by no means as simple as it seems, on the assumption that Semitic religion and custom grew up untouched by outer influences and practice.

Nor is it by any means certain that Arabia was the original home of the Semitic stock. The Phœnician traditions point to the mouth of the Euphrates as the original seat of the race, and it is here that their traces are earliest found. From the same region the Hebrews migrated westwards, according to the Old Testament; and the history of early races generally connects their home with the valley of some important river, and with fertile and well-watered plains.

Arabia is distinguished by the absence of all those natural advantages, on which primitive man mainly depended. The conditions of life were hard in its deserts; and we should expect, on ordinary grounds of suitability, that they would rather be the refuge of the idle and the weak, driven out by the rich and industrious, than the home of a race celebrated for its energy, its intelligence, and its trading genius.

Dr. Robertson Smith has not failed to draw the very evident distinction between the teaching of the great Hebrew prophets and the superstitions of the polytheistic Semites. His conclusions may therefore be considered, without any prejudice on the score of their effect on our appreciation of the noble character of the writings of Isaiah, or of the other higher teachers of the Hebrews. Still it is to be doubted whether he has not failed to appreciate the possibilities of ordinary thought, among a people to whom we owe the noblest of literatures, and the religion of our own age; and whether he has not taken in far too literal a sense the thoughts which are expressed in early records of their beliefs. If we are correct in understanding that he sees some connexion with *totemism* in the fable with which Jotham lashed the men of Shechem, we cannot but regard such an explanation as highly improbable. The biting satire of that allegory belongs to the literature of an age when civilisation was already ancient in the East, and when savage superstitions, even if they had ever existed, had long since perished among those who could write and read. If he still believes that swine were, at some time or other, regarded as sacred animals, we can only consider such a supposition as the unnatural product of a highly artificial theory, and as contrary not only to the Biblical prohibition, but also to the evidence of all ancient accounts of Egyptians and Semites, among whom the pig was held in abhorrence as an unclean and evil beast. But we are not concerned merely with such details, or with the occasionally wild interpretation of Semitic words and names. Our dissent is one of a more general character, concerning the principles and data on which he founds his explanations of ancient custom and belief.

We believe that we do our author no injustice when we say that his system is summed up in the three expressions: *totem*, *taboo*, and *matriarchate*, such being the leading ideas which he elaborates in both the works under our present consideration. It is supposed by the school of theorists to which Dr. Robertson Smith belongs that the best light on the early

beliefs of the Semites is to be derived from the superstitions and customs of the Red Indians, the Polynesians, and the natives of Africa, as known to us in recent times. The answer is evident. The true method of studying the subject lies in a careful and exhaustive research into the earliest religious and historic records of the Semitic peoples, and into the languages of their various stocks; into the pictorial symbolism of their monuments, and into the archaic survivals among their more primitive existing populations. The comparison with other races, living in other lands and ages, and under other conditions, should come last, not first. The error is the same into which the student of language falls, when he attempts to apply the grammatical rules fitted to one group of human languages to another group of distinct formation. To assume that all mankind has passed through the same stages of advance, and has reached similar civilisations from similar origins, is to start with a principle not only not proven, but also very contrary to the teaching of history and of antiquarian study. To postulate that the savage of to-day necessarily presents to us the exact conditions of primitive man is to demand of us consent to a principle which has often been called in question, on scientific grounds, and which we have little chance of fairly judging.

The word *totem* includes our author's conception of the origin of Semitic religion. Under the word *taboo* may be grouped his ideas as to religious rites; while the *matriarchate* sums up his views as to the earliest social conditions of the race. Considering his views under these headings, we may, perhaps, come to the conclusion that the ideas are all equally foreign to the true conceptions of ancient society in Asia, as are the words in which they are conveyed; and this not because we would argue simply from a Biblical point of view, but because the monuments and ancient literature of the East, which form the best sources of information, forbid us to come to any such conclusions.

If we have correctly appreciated the teaching intended to be conveyed, it appears that we are to conclude that the original gods of the savage Semites were evil spirits, having the forms of animals—generally savage, which were the *totems* of the race. That is to say, which were conceived to be relatives of the men who were called after them, who were forbidden to kill or eat them, and who believed themselves to be originally descended from such an animal, and so related to their gods. If such is the conclusion to

which Dr. Robertson Smith would lead us, we can only say that it involves improbabilities of various kinds, and that it is not supported by any real evidence, but rather misconceives the early ideas of mankind as known to us in various ways. That these evil and bestial deities—adored for no very evident reason—were transformed in later times, by an agricultural population, into beneficent deities, giving to their worshippers the blessings of prosperity, is also a conception which is not in accord with the facts of ancient religious belief; nor has any real proof been found forthcoming, to show that animal worship ever formed part of Semitic practice, whatever may be the case in other countries. It is certain that savages have often endeavoured to propitiate the fierce animals of which they stood in dread; that the Caffre falls down on his knees when he sees the savage quagga in the distance, and dreads to look at the hippopotamus or the crocodile, as much as the Indian dreads the grizzly bear. It is true that the meat of various animals—the boar, the fish, the hare, and the camel—has often been forbidden among primitive tribes; but a reason has been given for such prohibitions which appears to be of very general application. Savage men have very generally supposed that the qualities of the animal eaten are absorbed by the eater; that the heart of a brave enemy devoured by the cannibal adds courage to the heart of the victor; that the weakness of fish diet makes men weak; that the flesh of camels makes them morose and quarrelsome as camels are; and that the cowardice of the hare may result from feeding on its flesh, which is sometimes allowed to women but not to men. It is equally true that early writers describe their heroes as lions and bulls, and that early artists represent the gods with the heads of lions, bulls, and eagles; and it is possible that the more stupid and unimaginative, in all cases, have taken these symbolic terms and forms as representing actual facts and beings, just as the degraded Siberian still does, or as the Chinese believed in a distant land, where the men were all dogs married to human wives. But mankind has never been prone to underestimate its own superiority; and the ancients claimed descent, not from brutes, but from deities, whom they regarded as more powerful and intelligent than mortals. The poet who likens Thothes III. to a lion, an eagle, a bull, and a crocodile, no more intended his master to regard these expressions as insinuating descent from either animal than the Caffre does when in praise of the power and craft of his chief he calls him

‘the crocodile man.’ If Arab tribes called themselves after the names of fierce or beautiful beasts and birds, as among ourselves men bear the family names of Bull and Colt, this cannot be taken as evidence that they claimed actual descent from such animals. If they called themselves ‘sons of the ‘crescent,’ they did not thereby intend us to understand that the crescent became the human wife of their ancestor. An Egyptian goddess bears a feather on her shoulders instead of a head, which is a striking instance of the symbolic character of the various heads of sculptured deities. We should not thence conclude that the worshippers of this goddess claimed descent from a feather.

The ancient conception of the world, as manifested in Egyptian hymns and Akkadian litanies, was a dualistic conception, such as reached its most dogmatic climax in the Persian religion. All the forces of nature, and of the supernatural, were regarded according as they affected the well-being of man; and as being the acts of spirits friendly or inimical—good or bad. The good spirits, who were as innumerable as were the demons against whom they constantly fought, poured on their favourites and worshippers the benefits of good health, wealth, numerous progeny, well-watered pastures, fruitful fields and flocks, and success against the foe. The demons, when not kept at bay by amulets and other appeals to the protecting spirits, were able to inflict misery, disease, defeat and death, famine and the loss of children, of property, and of living possessions. According to the Akkadians, every disease had its demonic originator—plague, sunstroke, fever, and leprosy, were the work of special devils. From the sweat of Osiris, according to the Egyptians, grew every fair flower and plant; from that of Set, the god of darkness and evil, sprang poisons and thorns. In all fair spots, by running streams, in forests, and under mighty trees, the good spirits, nymphs and dryads, took up their abode. In the marshes and ruins, the desert and the dark cave, the devils lurked and lay in wait for men. To man in early days all nature appeared instinct with animal life. The sun, moon, and planets moved in the heavens, walking its crystal floor, or soaring on unseen wings. The tree which waved its boughs, the stone which fell from heaven, or was dashed by the thunderbolt from the cliff, the fire which ran and devoured, the stream which rushed from its source, the unseen wind which smote the trees and trampled the grass—all these were living things, no less than man or beast; they were

the bodies, or the manifestations, of beings superior to man, immortal as the heavenly bodies, irresistible as the fire, the flood. or the tempest; fair and long-living like the tree, strong and immoveable as the mountain or the rock. That which was friendly to man was loved and invoked and praised; that which wrought him evil was shunned and deprecated, and never willingly mentioned. Such were the natural beliefs which find expression in early literature and art, and in the practice of worship on the one side, and of magical exorcism on the other. In failing to appreciate this dualism, and in regarding the original gods of the Semites as savage animals, rather than as beneficent beings, Dr. Robertson Smith appears to make a cardinal mistake in his treatment of the subject. He tells us indeed that man regarded all natural moving objects as alive, but he considers that when the gods were addressed as 'father' and 'king,' we are to understand that they were regarded as physical ancestors of the tribes, who had procreated them in the forms of certain beasts from which they were named. It is highly improbable that such ideas could have existed, except amongst the most stupid of the tribesmen whom the early poets of the race addressed; and to suppose that a race capable of rising to the intellectual heights gained by the early Hebrew psalmists continued to hold such a religion, is surely to undervalue the intelligence and culture of so remarkable a people. If it is urged in answer that the author refers only to prehistoric times, we may say that his references are to a comparatively late literature; and that save through comparative study of language we know next to nothing of the 'pre-historic history' of a people who had written records about 3000 B.C.

A second assumption, equally unfortunate, is that of 'tribal deities,' having no connexion with each other. It is true that minor demigods and heroes had a local reputation only, and were supposed to possess only a local and limited power. It is also true that the local names of deities were innumerable, and that these titles or appellations, constantly increasing, were distinct and not widely applied. But, on the other hand, we have monumental evidence that such titles were known to be merely local names for deities widely worshipped. Assyrian scribes have collected, in cuneiform tablets, the various names by which various tribes called the god of Storm and Thunder, who was known as Rimmon at Nineveh. Istar of Arbela was no more considered a distinct divine person from Istar of Babylon,

than the Madonna of Loreto is distinct from Notre Dame de la Haine. From the earliest times down to the days of Muhammad, throughout all Semitic regions, from Assyria to Moab and Arabia, from Phœnicia to Egypt, the greater gods were adored under the same names—*El* for the god of Heaven, *Ashtoreth* for the Moon, *Shamash* for the Sun, and 'the Baal' for the 'master' of the shrine, or land, or special function, from which his special name was derived. The gods common to the Semitic races were equivalent to those adored by the Greeks and the Akkadians, including the gods of Heaven, Hell, and Ocean, the Sun and Moon, and in an inferior category, the Planets. To suppose that they were mere personifications of animals, good and evil, is to create a new theory unknown to the ancients, and there is no evidence which has ever been adduced to show that the Semitic people worshipped or deprecated any animal. Among the more ignorant Egyptians in savage times, and in the later days of decaying superstition, such worship does indeed appear, as it appears also among modern Africans; but the great gods of Egypt, whom the poets hymned, were the spirits of heaven—the Sun, the Dawn, the Moon, the living waters of the Nile, and the fresh breeze from the west. The Hittite princes swore faith to Rameses, not by any bestial gods, but in the names of the ruler of earth and sky, of the mountains and the rivers of their own land, of the clouds, and the great deep.

The Babylonian pictured the dead as brought prisoners before the dread deity of Ocean seated on his throne of judgement; they hymned the god of Day as driving back the evil demons of darkness; as breathing on the Euphrates, and making the fields green with living water. The heavy dews of the moonlight nights were, to them, the waters poured forth by Mother Istar from her cup upon the lands of her children; the thunder was the voice, and the lightning was the sword, of the terrible god who dwelt in cloudy tabernacles, and walked abroad on the wings of mighty winds, and whose name was Rimmon. Such was the actual character of a mythology which was not tribal, because the phenomena whence it arose were not confined to any special district, though special shrines became from time to time identified with celebrated manifestations of divine power, famous as oracles, or noted as places where many prayers had been favourably answered. As civilisation increased (and that not at a late period, but in Egypt, at least, as early as 1400 B.C., and in Chaldea perhaps earlier), a yet

higher belief was formulated, in hymns which are still preserved, and which scholars have rendered into every European language. Men observed that sun and moon and planets were subject to unvarying laws; that the winter storms lasted only until the summer came back; that the mighty powers—once regarded as irresponsible and independent—were controlled by something greater than themselves. They recognised the single and unscen Power which ruled the heavens as well as the earth, and which the Egyptian poet hymns as the father and creator long before the Greek philosophy inherited the great idea. It is by the light of such facts that we must study the natural religions of the Semites rather than by the superstitions of America and Polynesia, or by the theories of those who make no use of those sources of knowledge which we possess.

Dr. Robertson Smith, however, contends that religious rites and laws are more important to an understanding of the subject than any mythology or hymnology of the ancients. He even believes that myths originated from customs, and not customs from myths; but in this case we are often left without any reason for the custom itself. Why men should have performed certain rites, unless on account of certain beliefs, it is difficult to understand; nor is it clear what custom will explain the myth which makes the Sun a bird soaring in heaven, or a deity sailing the blue waters in his boat. The worship of the heavenly bodies was a late worship according to our author's view, yet on the ordinary principles of comparative philology it should be regarded as a very early one, since the names for these deities are common to so many Semitic stocks. The *jinnis* were, according to our lecturer, the original deities of the Semites, and were evil spirits in the forms of serpents and savage beasts. This is not, however, a correct appreciation of Arab beliefs as to the *jinnis*. These spirits, who appear to have been of Persian origin—judging from the word—are always divided into two categories: some are beneficent spirits, even believed to have embraced the Moslem faith; others are evil spirits, generally distinguished by a word which is also non-Semitic—as ghouls. The ancient dualism survives in Arab beliefs, and the good and evil *jinnis* (of whom the former are unnoticed by our author) were the direct descendants of the *fravashis* and *druants* of the old Persian system—the genii and the larvæ of the Romans—inferior spirits who never attained to the dignity of the great national and heavenly gods.

From the theory of tribal gods which thus appears to be unsound, it follows that the theorist is led to regard Jehovah as the tribal god of the Hebrews. It cannot be said that such a view is supported by the evidence to be found in the Bible. Although we are told that the sacred name was unknown to the early patriarchs, yet we are equally told that Jehovah was adored before the Hebrews became a nation (Gen. iv. 26; Exod. vi. 3). Balaam from Pethor, beyond the Euphrates, was a servant of Jehovah (Num. xxii. 5). Sennacherib claimed (2 Kings xviii. 25) that he came up against Hezekiah in the name and by the command of Jehovah. To the prophets Jehovah was the only true God, and a God adored by other nations as well as by the Hebrews (Mal. i. 11). It can only have been among the very ignorant and unthinking that Jehovah can, in any Hebrew age, have been regarded as a deity merely powerful in Palestine. The social necessities which obliged the stranger to do reverence to the idols in the land in which he dwelt, and in which the name of his own god was unknown, did not prevent him from retaining his own belief. When Naaman the Syrian recognised the power of Jehovah, he still was forced, by politic considerations, to continue to bow the knee to the savage Baal of his lord and master. Are the obligatory services exacted from Jews or Protestants, or from the Christians who burnt incense to Cæsar's statue, to be considered as showing that they forgot their own beliefs? And in like manner does the fact that the Hebrew of Hezekiah's time regarded no shrine as holy save that in Jerusalem justify us in supposing that, in the land of exile, he forgot the God of his fathers, or supposed His arm to be shortened, not reaching the city of the oppressor?

Turning to the question of rites connected with Semitic religions, we find an extraordinary theory to lie at the basis of Dr. Robertson Smith's explanation. That he applies the word *taboo* to religious and legal restrictions without distinction of what was pure or clean and evil or impure, is not an important matter, though the incongruity of the word is striking; but the origin of sacrifices, according to his opinion, is to be sought in a practice of supplying food to gods who were originally sacred animals, mainly, it would seem, carnivorous. The theory of the animal origin of the gods is as little satisfactory as the ghost theory of Mr. Herbert Spencer. The ancients feared the dead, and deprecated the rage of savage beasts; but what they worshipped was something very different—namely, *life*, and

above all, *immortal* life, as manifested in heaven. The ghosts they called 'shades,' 'weak things,' and 'evil ones;' the gods were 'the strong ones,' 'the 'immortals,' 'the breathing 'ones.' Such are the meanings of the words in almost every Asiatic language. We are, however, now told that the ancient Semite claimed to be of one kin with his flocks and herds, and regarded their sacrifice as the murder of relatives; that his deities were the beasts in question, and that sacrifice was the feeding of these material objects of worship. Nevertheless, when devoting a whole lecture to the sacred objects which appeared in all heathen temples—the holy tree, the holy water, and the holy stone, to which our author might have added the sacred flame—he fails to discover evidence of holy animals, save in the doves and fish which found asylum in Astarte's temples. That such animals were protected, by a goddess who had no bloody sacrifices in her shrines, is no evidence that the Moon goddess was originally either a dove or a fish; and if it has been possible to find an Arab tribe mentioned who held the dog sacred, this only proves the Persian influence in Arabia, for to all pure Semites the dog is unclean, and only protected because it is the guardian of the village at night. The sacredness of the dove and the fish is still a Syrian superstition, to which category may also be added the owl; but one of the marked differences between the Semitic peoples on the one hand, and the Asiatic Aryans and Egyptians on the other, is that they had no sacred beasts. They sacrificed flocks and herds and camels to their gods, and the only reason why they did not habitually live on their flesh was that which still holds good—namely, that they formed the riches of the tribe in lieu of hoarded gold, and could only be afforded as food on rare festal occasions. The Arab, who treasured the pedigree of his herds, no more regarded the oxen as his relatives than does the owner of a modern racehorse.

The further evidence, supposed to exist in the representation of deities with animal heads, or with attendant animals, is equally doubtful. To refer to the winged horse on a Carthaginian coin is unsafe, considering its date; while the symbolism of Assyria and Babylon was all certainly borrowed from the non-Semitic race. The same is probably true of the Phœnician symbolism, which goes back to the rude sculptures of the non-Semitic races of Asia Minor and Syria. It is with the superstitions of the Canaanites and Akkadians, rather than with Semitic beliefs, that we are

here dealing, but the Akkadian gods were certainly not of animal origin. Dagon (or Oannes) had a fish's tail because he was the god of the Sea. Ashtoreth (Istar) had the horns of the crescent moon, of which she was the goddess. Anu, the Sky god, had the wings of an eagle, as had also Shamash, the Sun, because he flew high in the heavens. This is not *totemism*, but hieroglyphic representation.

But the theory of sacrifices, as food provided for animal gods, may be also traversed by a more important objection. It is insufficient to account for an extremely ancient and widespread custom, to which our author does not allude. In the rude chambers where the early Europeans laid their dead, long before the traders of Asia had brought any metal weapons to their lands, there have been found, in regular array, earthenware bowls, containing remains of fish bones, beef bones, and shells—offerings to the manes or ghosts of the dead, which were sealed up beneath the earthen mound, and never eaten by man or beast. This practice was universal in the ancient world, from Egypt to China. Among the Scythians the chief was accompanied to his grave by slain wives and warriors and slaves. In Etruria the horse was killed and buried with his master. The pious Chinese still burns paper representations of every object that can be of use to the departed on his long journey to the unknown land. In India, and in the Caucasus, suttee had the same origin—the wife went with her husband to the land of death. This constant custom, which is represented in Egyptian pictures, shows us that primitive man believed that unseen spirits might, in some unknown manner, receive sustenance and pleasure, from the ghosts as it were of material foods and drinks, from the odour of the sacrifices in which the gods were said to delight, and from the life blood of the victim whose flesh was eaten by the worshipper himself. This explanation has so often been given, that only a rigid adherent to the dogma of the *totem* would have failed to notice it, being far more simple and comprehensive than that which he offers as accounting for a universal human practice.

As regards the social relations of the ancient Semites, and of other Asiatic races, the objections which it is natural to raise to the views of the school to which Dr. Robertson Smith belongs are of equal importance. This question is mainly treated in his volume on 'Kinship and Marriage,' in which it appears that the argument is intended to prove three principal assertions. First, that the original Semites

were polyandrous—that is to say, that every woman had two or more lawful husbands, usually brothers. Secondly, that descent was traced through the mother, and not from the paternal house. And thirdly, that the kinship of the clan, whether connected by birth or not, is older than the family, since the family did not at first exist. These views have been very generally repeated by various writers on the subject, but in each case they appear to rest on most slender grounds, and to be contradicted by very important indications. They do not originate with our author, but have been adopted by him with much conviction; and he has set himself a hard task in trying to collect evidence favouring this theory, and in explaining away the difficulties with which it is beset.

The relation of the sexes to each other is a matter of proportion, and of comparative wealth. In cases where the men are more numerous, and where wives cannot be captured from other tribes, it has no doubt occasionally become customary for a woman to be the wife of several men; but the accounts of ancient writers show that such a condition was unusual, and was regarded with surprise and horror. At the present time it is known to us chiefly through the survival of certain rude aborigines of India, but Cæsar states that it was a British custom in his own time. In Thibet several brothers share a wife between them, but what has been called ‘Nair polyandry’ is a condition of the grossest immorality. Other instances might be cited, always isolated and exceptional; for it must be remembered that, in a time of constant conflict and war, the chances of life for the man were far less than for the woman. When tribes were decimated by defeat, and escaped by flight, the superior number of the women led, in many known historic cases, to polygamy; but the polygamy of Asia appears to have been generally restricted, as it still is, to the richer or more powerful class; the peasant as a rule has but one wife, because he cannot afford to support two, or to pay the dowry which is, and always has been, expected. The reasons which induce Dr. Robertson Smith to leap boldly to the conclusion that polyandry was once universal in Arabia, appear to be mainly two. First, that some tribes are (as he holds) named after an ancestress; and secondly, that Strabo says of an Arab tribe in Yemen (xiv. 4), ‘They all have one wife,’ and proceeds to describe a condition of morals which resulted. The first argument has been met on linguistic grounds, which appear sufficient, and as regards the second, if we are to trust

Strabo as a well-informed authority, it is nevertheless not to a primitive society that he refers, but to one which had been corrupted by centuries of luxury and trading life. From such data to conclude that the Semites reversed their original social arrangements, at some early period, and claimed kinship afterwards, through the father instead of through the mother, is, to say the least, bold. Dr. Robertson Smith has himself quoted passages which show that, in the time of Muhammad and earlier, the son was reckoned to belong to his father's house. It is unnecessary to say that, in the Old Testament and on the monuments of Babylonia and Phœnicia, the same rule can be traced back to the earliest times. In Yemen itself we have monumental evidence earlier than Strabo's time, for the royal house of Saba traced from father to son. Exceptional cases are known among the Arabs when queens ruled instead of kings; and the Chinese stigmatised a certain tribe as the *Nui Kwan*, or 'woman-ruled'; but since among all uncivilised races the position of woman, as the household drudge and slave of her master, is so much lower than that which the chivalry of a later age allowed, it is surely not natural to suppose that, in the earliest times, her independence was complete, and her position that of the head of the family. It is true that the Lydians and the Etruscans—who were luxurious tribes of the same stock—are said to have traced descent from their mothers, but the accounts given of the society in which this abnormal arrangement occurred, show that it was rather a decaying than a primitive condition into which the race had relapsed.

The further idea that the clan or tribe was a unity before the family also arises from the same supposition that, in the earliest ages, marriage of any kind was non-existent. This view has of late been ably met* by the contrary contention that marriage is the oldest of human institutions, and that the family was the first unit, whence sprang the tribe and the race. Linguistic evidence points to the same conclusion, and carries back the names of 'father' and 'mother' to the most remote period. The simple sounds *Pa* and *Ma*, in Semitic, Turanian, and Aryan speech alike, signify 'he who gives breath' and 'she who makes'; and if such prehistoric evidence is of any value, the child must have called its parents by these familiar terms (or by their reduplications *Papa* and *Mamma*) long before the early tribes separated,

* History of Human Marriage, by E. Westermarck, London, 1891.

and the various Asiatic stocks grew up and became distinct in their various new centres. For such reasons it appears only reasonable to deny that any sufficient evidence has been adduced to show that the original social customs of the Semites were once entirely opposite to those which they observed in the earliest age of which we have any record.

The present review has been penned, not with any intention of depreciating the learning or the industry of Dr. Robertson Smith, but in the interests of scientific study, on a sound basis, of Asiatic antiquities. It is not difficult to state new theories concerning well-known facts. It is not difficult to take a new view of the world by standing on one's head; but such a view is non-natural; and conclusions which run counter to the plain statements of antiquity are not likely to have any permanent value. It is easy to under-rate the intelligence of the old civilised world, and to put a literal meaning to ancient words, which they never bore in the mouths of those who used them; but this is to sink to the level of the most backward and unintelligent among the superstitious peasantry, rather than to rise to the conceptions of artists and poets. The scholar who has become acquainted with the 'Sacred Books of the East,' and has waded through their wearisome pages, full of obsolete superstitions, philosophies, and theories of nature, finding only here and there a glimpse of something better in Buddha's compassion for the unhappy, or in the Persian love of right and truth, cannot but feel that it is to the Semitic race that we owe the noblest thought, and the most inspired teaching, that has ever been given to the world through the medium of one race. It is difficult, therefore, without better cause being shown than can be discovered in the works above considered, to accept the conclusion that this literature proceeded from a polyandrous race, worshipping savage beasts, and conceiving for itself no higher than a bestial origin. It is the more unnecessary to do so when the evidence put forward depreciates the witness of the monuments of that race, in favour of a comparison with the degraded ideas of the savages of Polynesia and of the Congo.

- ART. III.—1. *Voyage et Avantures de François Leguat et de ses compagnons en deux isles désertes des Indes Orientales.* 2 vols. Londres: 1708.
2. *The Voyage of François Leguat of Bresse to Rodriguez, Mauritius, Jara, and the Cape of Good Hope.* Transcribed from the First English Edition. Edited and annotated by Captain PASFIELD OLIVER, late Royal Artillery. 2 vols. Hakluyt Society. London: 1891.
3. *The Dodo and its Kindred; or, the History, Affinities, and Osteology of the Dodo, Solitaire, and other Extinct Birds of the Islands, Mauritius, Rodriguez, and Bourbon.* By H. E. STRICKLAND and A. G. MELVILLE, M.D. London: 1848.
4. *An Account of the Petrological, Botanical, and Zoological Collections made in Kerguelen's Land and Rodriguez during the Transit of Venus Expeditions carried out by order of Her Majesty's Government in the Years 1874-75.* Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Vol. 158. London: 1879.
5. *Un Projet de République à l'Île d'Eden (Île Bourbon) en 1629.* Par le Marquis HENRI DU QUESNE. Précédé d'une notice par TH. SAUZIER. Paris: 1887.

TRADITION has too long assigned to Don Pedro Mascarenhas the discovery of that group of islands to the eastward of Madagascar with which his name has been popularly associated for considerably more than three centuries; whereas, from M. Codine's exhaustive investigations, it appears more than probable that the islands which form the Mascarene Archipelago—viz. Réunion, Mauritius, and Rodriguez—may have been first discovered and named by Diogo Fernandes Pereira, a veteran pilot, who seems to have been in command of the Portuguese ship *Cirne* during the temporary absence of its real commander, the illustrious Don Afonso d'Albuquerque, in the year 1507, at least five years before Don Pedro Mascarenhas rediscovered the same group in 1512. On this point exact certainty seems unattainable, so long, at least, as the Spanish and Portuguese archives remain buried in obscurity; * but be this as it may,

* Mr. F. C. Danvers, Superintendent of Records at the India Office, having obtained permission from the authorities at Lisbon to search and examine the records in the State archives relating to Portuguese India, has been sent thither by the Secretary of State for India in Council to obtain information which may help to fill up the serious

it is clear that these volcanic islands, teeming with rich and peculiar natural productions, became known to the Portuguese navigators early in the sixteenth century, although it was not until the middle of the following century that their capabilities as settlements were rightly appreciated, and even then they were regarded much in the same light as Ascension and St. Helena in the South Atlantic—that is, merely as ports of call for ships proceeding to and from the East Indies, where potable water and fresh provisions were easily procurable.

The Dutch, who were by far the most active at this period in developing their trade with the Indies, first formed an establishment in Mauritius about 1639,* and the French, who soon became aware of the importance of the East Indian trade, were not slow in claiming possession of Mascareigne, as the westernmost island was then designated, shortly afterwards, but both islands were several times abandoned and reoccupied; whilst Rodriguez, the smallest of the group, lying three hundred miles further to windward, alone remained uninhabited until a small party of French refugees, under the protection of the Dutch flag, attempted to found a colony there towards the end of the seventeenth century. The story of these Huguenot adventurers and their painful experiences are well related by their leader, who was the senior of the three survivors who reached Holland eight years after leaving Europe in pursuance of their futile project.

In the same year that Don Pedro Mascarenhas rediscovered the islands that bear his name, one Pierre Le Guat, secretary to Charles, Duke of Savoy, acquired the fief and built the house of La Fougère, an estate situated in the small province of Bresse, between the banks of the Rhône and the Saône, now represented by the department of Aix; and it was here that one of his descendants, François Leguat, was born about the year 1633, in the reign of Louis XIII., during the last decade of the Thirty Years' War, when France acquired Alsace and the left bank of the Rhine, whilst

gaps that occur in the India Office records during the early period of British trade in India.

* Prince Roland Bonaparte has lately published a brochure on this subject:—*'Le premier établissement des Néerlandais à Maurice.'* Paris, G. Chamerot, 1890. He reproduces in facsimile four views from the works of the Dutch voyagers of the seventeenth century. The frontispiece purports to represent the present state of the site of the old fort, but the ruin shown is, in reality, of quite modern construction.

Richelieu was at the height of his power. Of Leguat's early life we learn but little, as he is extremely reticent on this subject, probably because he had but little to say—'Story! God bless you! I have none to tell, sir!' He seems to have lived the life of a country gentleman, and was most likely one of the few Protestant landlords who remained at home when the Catholic nobles around him flocked to bask in the smiles of royalty at Paris. That he was fond of a retired country life is certain, but whether this arose from a satiety or disgust of court life during his previous career it is impossible to discover. According to his own account, he was over fifty years old when he was driven by the persecution of the Protestants in his native country to seek refuge in Holland four years after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. At this time the Marquis Henri du Quesne, son of the great commander of that name, proposed to establish a Protestant colony in the island of Mascareigne, which, he had reason to suppose, had been abandoned by the French, and he published several brochures—'emigrant traps,'* as Mr. Strickland calls them—in which the island was depicted as a veritable garden of Paradise, and fancifully designated, in consequence, the Island of Eden. According to a manuscript note, ascribed by M. Sauzier to the Marquis himself, the States-General of the United Provinces granted a fief of this island for the purpose of colonisation, a donation which, however, was speedily revoked, because, in fact, it was outside their dominion.

Among other French refugees who were attracted by the highly coloured advertisements put forth by Du Quesne was François Leguat, who, being a gentleman of some moderate means, obtained an appointment as 'Major,' in name at least, to one of the vessels then fitting out for the transportation of the emigrants, who were offered a free passage to the newly projected Huguenot colony in Eden. By means of

* See 'The Dodo and its Kindred,' p. 60. One of these remarkable pamphlets, hitherto only known to bibliographers by the extracts quoted in Leguat's book, has been rescued from utter oblivion by M. Sauzier, of Mauritius, who fortunately discovered the rare pages, bound up in the same cover with a copy of a well-known volume of travel—'Voyage aux Indes Orientales, par M. Dellon, 1685.' This pamphlet purports to contain a collection of several memoirs, entitled 'Recueil de quelques mémoires servans d'instruction pour l'établissement de l'Isle d'Eden, à Amsterdam, 1689.' Whether this small work contains a complete set of the Du Quesne memoirs seems doubtful, as passages quoted by Leguat are certainly not to be found included in the pages reprinted by M. Sauzier.

such free passages the Dutch East India Company had been enabled to people the lands about its establishments and forts in South Africa and the East Indies. The newly arrived immigrants were allowed to range and view the country, where they were encouraged to select an unoccupied plot of land, and assisted in the stocking and cultivation; the land thus stocked was entailed on them and their heirs free of any rent under certain restrictions. In this manner the flourishing colony of French Protestants at Drakenstein, in Cape Colony, had just been founded in 1688. This original expedition proved altogether abortive, the States-General having revoked their donation, as above mentioned; and, the Marquis having learnt that the French East India Company was actually in possession of Mascareigne, the equipment of the vessels was stopped, greatly to the disappointment of the intending emigrants. Nevertheless the wily Marquis concealed the true facts of the case from his co-religionists, and fitted out a small frigate, named the 'Hirondelle,' whose commander, one Captain Antoine Valleau, was directed to take Leguat and nine of his associates to the island of Diego Ruys, the smallest island of the Mascarene group, afterwards known as Rodrigue, or Rodriguez, the only one which, as before remarked, still remained unoccupied. Accordingly the 'Hirondelle' sailed from Texel in July, 1690, having on board the ten adventurers, of whom at least six were men of no mean fortunes, who had embarked supposing that they were bound for the desirable Island of Eden.

After a voyage of ten months' duration, these unfortunate victims of Du Quesne's duplicity were carried past their supposed destination in Mascareigne, and at last, after being tantalised by a passing glimpse of their promised Eden, eight of the associates were landed in a bay on the north side of Rodriguez at the end of April, 1691. One of their number, who had succumbed to scurvy at sea, was replaced by one of the ship's hands, and two of the younger adventurers were retained on board the 'Hirondelle' when she left the island. Although greatly incensed with the captain for his treachery in not landing them according to promise at Mascareigne, Leguat and his companions were not altogether displeased by the aspect of the charming island on which they found themselves so unexpectedly; and understanding that they would be visited by a ship from Europe within two years from the date of their arrival, they made up their minds to make themselves comfortable and exploit

the island with a view to founding a permanent colony if it were possible :—

‘L’Isle nous parut extrêmement belle, et de loin et de près. . . . Effectivement ce petit Mond nouveau nous paroissoit tout rempli de charmes et de délices nous en trouvions tout l’aspect admirable. Nous ne pouvions nous lasser de regarder les petites montagnes dont elle est presque toute composée, tant elles étoient richement couvertes de grands et beaux arbres. Les ruisseaux que nous en voyions découler, tomboient dans les vallons de la fertilité desquels il nous étoit impossible de douter ; et après s’être répandus dans quelques espaces de terrain uni, auquel je ne donnerai le nom ni de forêt ni de plaine, quoi qu’ils pussent recevoir l’un et l’autre, ils se venoient jeter à nos yeux dans la mer. Quelcun de nous se souvint du fameux Lignon, et de ces divers endroits enchantez qui sont si agréablement décrits dans le Roman de Mr d’Urfé, mais nôtre esprit se porta incontinent à une toute autre pensée. Nous admirâmes les secrets et divins ressorts de la Providence, qui après avoir permis que nous eussions été ruinez, dans nôtre Patrie, nous en avoit ensuite arrachez par diverses merveilles et voulut enfin essuyer nos larmes dans le Paradis Terrestre qu’elle nous montrait.’

This trust in Providence is characteristic of the spirit of the Huguenot author. In the first paragraph of his book he relates how Providence led him to Holland, the same expression is continually met with throughout his volumes and ‘la bonne Providence’ are almost the last words of his narrative. Considering the antecedents of the adventurers, thus left to their own resources, the speedy collapse of the Marquis du Quesne’s projected scheme of colonisation was a foregone conclusion. Its hopelessness was inherent from its original conception. Leguat, who evidently considered himself as the leader—‘que l’on mit à la tête des autres’—cannot have been the practical energetic man that was requisite for such an undertaking. He seems rather to have been a weak, patient, much-enduring gentleman, and his character was more that of a religious visionary enthusiast than that of a leader of men. He describes himself as summoned to this voyage by a vision :—

‘A peine commençois-je à revenir de l’étonnement où j’étois,
Qui me sembloit avoir été causé par un Songe,
Lors qu’une Voix m’appella
De dedans un Vaisseau prêt à faire Voile.
J’y courus,
Et après une longue & dangereuse Navigation,
Je fus amené dans cette Isle, avec mes Compagnons.’

Apparently he had not the slightest authority over the

younger members of the small community, and, indeed, the brethren who formed the republican and Protestant commune of Rodriguez were certainly an oddly assorted party of pioneers—not altogether dissimilar to that famous company which followed the lead of the bellman in the ‘Hunting of the Snark.’ Jacques de la Case, the eldest of them, was thirty years old, and had been an officer in the army of the Elector of Brandenburg; Isaac Boyer, next in seniority, was the son of an apothecary; Jean Testard, a druggist; Jean de la Haye, a silversmith, and Paul Bénelle, son of a merchant of Metz. All the above appear to have been gentlefolk of moderate means, who had never touched a spade or turned a clod in their lives. ‘C’étoient des gens de Famille honorable, qui avoient du bien. Mais comme cette Colonie de M. du Quesne faisoit du bruit et qu’ils étoient jeunes, sains et gaillards, sans aucuns liens ni de Familles ni d’affaires, l’envie les prit de faire ce Voyage.’

Two others—Robert Anselin, a miller’s son, who acted in the capacity of servant, and Pierre Thomas, one of the crew of the ‘Hirondelle’—were of low rank, and probably did all the rougher work at the settlement. This last, Maître Pierre Thomas, being a sailor, was the only one of the party who smoked tobacco, and ‘quand son Tabac fut fini, il fuma des feuilles.’*

Obviously unfitted as these French *émigrés* were for agricultural labour or manual craft of any description, nevertheless they bravely set to work and cleared some ground on the only level bit of country near the landing-place, now known as Port Mathurin, and constructed some rude huts, for which the broad impervious fanlike fronds of the Latanier palms furnished an easy mode of roofing. When they proceeded to till the ground, however, it is not surprising to learn that their European seeds refused to germinate in many instances, or that their supposed wheat seed came up as tares: ‘au reste on ne doit pas conclurre que ce changement de blé en yvroye doive arriver toujourns, puis qu’on voit souvent de pareilles degenerations en Europe.’ Notwithstanding their horticultural failures, the natural productions of the rich insular soil were so prolific that

* Jean Pagni, quaintly designated as ‘Prosclyte et Praticien de Roan’ (still more curiously translated in the English version as ‘Convert and Patrician!’) was the unfortunate man who died on board the ‘Hirondelle’ before reaching Rodriguez.

there was no fear of starvation. On shore they found plenty of land tortoises, wood hens, and other very good fowl (of which more hereafter), so tame that they hardly required enticing in order to be killed. 'Alors la Providence nous 'disoit *Tuë et mange*, et nous n'avions qu'à battre le fusil et 'à faire du feu pour faire grand' chere.' The palm trees supplied vegetable sustenance and wine, whilst within the coral reefs, which form extensive natural reservoirs and preserves, the newcomers were able to capture without resistance huge lomentins or dugongs and splendid green turtles, together with oysters, mullet, and other tropical fish which abound in such localities:—

'Puis que nous avions chair et poisson à notre choix et en abondance; du rôti, du bouilli, des soupes, des ragoûts, des herbes, des racines, d'excellens Melons avec d'autres fruits; de bon vin de palme, et de l'eau douce et pure; le Lecteur n'a pas eû peur, sans doute, de voir mourir de faim les pauvres Avanturiers de Rodrigue.'

Plenty of firewood as fuel, which they set alight with their burning glasses—*verres ardens*—afforded easy means of cooking their food; at night they fed their lamps with the oil of tortoise or turtle fat, and they wanted nothing but wheaten bread. This abundance of good cheer with a genial climate ensured them the enjoyment of a pleasant open-air life in absolute comfort. Leguat himself was wholly content with this idyllic repose:—

'Après tout, j'ai respiré là un air admirable, sans la moindre altération de ma santé. J'y ai été nourri en Prince, dans l'aise et dans l'abondance, sans pain, et sans Valets. J'y ai été riche sans Diamans, et sans or; comme sans Ambition. J'y ai goûté un secret et indicible contentement, de ce que j'étois moins exposé qu'à l'ordinaire aux tentations de pécher.'

The physical drawbacks from which the voluntary exiles suffered in this insular paradise were comparatively few, and the philosophical Leguat makes light of such minor evils. He enumerates them at length as follows: First, flies, large and small, against whose attacks on the meat in their larder they had to provide by constructing *gardes à manger* of thin trellis composed of fine fibres of the Latanier palm. Second, rats, which were most annoying, and in connexion with which an interpolation has been subsequently added, evidently by Leguat's editor, regarding Dick Whittington and his cat. Third, land crabs and robber crabs, which at certain seasons swarmed to such an extent that the settlers knocked over with sticks no fewer than three thousand in a single

evening. Fourth, scorpions, so small, however, as hardly to be worth mentioning, with caterpillars which infested their melon beds; and last, but not least, were the annual hurricanes, of which Leguat gives such a vivid description that his original words are well worth quoting at length:—

‘L’Ouragan que l’on essaye tous les ans dans les mois de Janvier ou de Février, comme je l’ai déjà marqué, est encore un terrible ennemi. Nous avons senti deux fois ses rudes assauts. Ce vent furieux s’élève ordinairement après un temps doux, et même après un grand calme; et sa plus grande violence dure au moins une heure. Alors nous vîmes plusieurs gros arbres renversez en un moment, et nos cabanes toutes fracassées. La mer bruiante et écumante, faisoit des mugissemens épouvantables; et élevant ses flots comme des montagnes elle les pousoit contre les côaux avec tant d’impetuosité qu’il sembloit que la Nature hors d’elle-même dût bien-tôt retourner dans son premier Cahos. Le Ciel se mêloit avec la terre. L’air s’épaississoit, et couvroit tout de ténèbres; les nues entassées fondoient enfin, et versioient une si grande abondance d’eau, que nos beaux et fertiles vallons inondez devenoient un nouvel Ocean. Tout ce que ces torrens rencontroient étoit terrassé et rapidement entraîné. Et je crois que si cette violence eût duré trois heures, il n’y auroit pas eu un seul arbre qui eût résisté. Le dernier des deux Ouragans que nous avons essayez à Rodrigue, fut beaucoup plus terrible que le premier. Au milieu de sa plus grande force, il se fit tout d’un coup un calme si grand, que l’on auroit entendu le moindre bruit, tellement que l’on crût que tout étoit passé; mais il recommença bientôt avec plus de furie qu’auparavant. Il détruisoit absolument tous nos jardins, parce que la violence de ce vent, élevant en l’air les eaux de la mer, porta par tout un déluge d’eau salée, qui brûla ou tua absolument tout ce que nous avions planté. Mais comme cela ne préjudicia pas au fond du terroir, dès que nous fumes sortis des trous des rochers où nous étions mis à l’abri, nous vinmes semer comme auparavant.’

Although the French settlers did not engage very strenuously in their agricultural pursuits, for which they cannot be much blamed, considering that the climatic conditions of life within the tropics are not conducive to hard, active manual labour, they had plenty of quiet amusements more suitable to the enervating atmosphere of Rodriguez.

‘Nous jouions quelquefois aux échecs, au tric-trac, aux dames, à la boule, et aux quilles. La chasse et la pêche étoient un peu trop aisées pour y prendre un fort grand plaisir. Nous en trouvions quelquefois à instruire des perroquets, dont le nombre, comme je l’ai dit, est fort grand dans cette Isle. Nous en portâmes un dans l’Isle Maurice qui parloit François et Flamand.’

We are also afforded a glimpse of the intellectual recreations of these pious Huguenots:—

‘Pour revenir à ce que j’ai commencé à dire de nos occupations ; j’ajouterais, sans Pharisisme, que nous avions tous les jours nos exercices de dévotion reglez. Le Dimanche, nous faisions à-peu-près ce que se pratiquoit dans nos Eglises de France, parceque nous avions la Bible entière, nos saints Cantiques, un ample commentaire sur tout le Nouveau Testament, et plusieurs Sermons de la vieille roche, qui étoient des Discours raisonnables.’

Leguat does not actually say in as many words that he expected his comrades to form a congregation and wished to become himself their minister and to form a church at Rodriguez, but he evidently implies that such effort was made ; and although disappointed, he gives some elaborate reasons why such a foundation could not be established.

‘Si nous eussions cru passer le reste de nos jours, ou y demeurer du moins fort long-temps, rien n’auroit empêché, ce me semble, que le plus sage d’entre nous n’eût été légitimement appelé par les autres à la charge de S. Ministere et que ces deux ou trois assemblez au nom de Dieu n’eussent pris la forme parfaite d’une vraie Eglise.’

Leguat, as we have before noticed, was far older than his companions, and would have been contented to remain at Rodriguez for the rest of his life ; but his comrades grew impatient at being cooped up in a desolate island, and their ardent desire to again mix with their fellow-men in the outer world, and more especially their longing for women’s society, impelled them to prepare the means of escape at all hazards. When M. du Quesne’s original expedition was projected, it had been arranged that a large proportion of women were to have been embarked for the fictitious Island of Eden, and doubtless the presence of women on the island would have largely assisted the permanence of the little colony.

‘Des Femmes, et dans cent ans d’ici, on auroit compté sept Paroisses, où vous remarquez nos sept huttes.’

With the enthusiasm of hope inspiring them, and doubtless under the guidance of the only mariner among them, Pierre Thomas, the adventurers were able to construct a boat from an unfashioned log of timber which had been washed ashore from the wreck of a ship. This rude craft was fitted with a sail, and duly victualled with the remains of biscuit which they still had in reserve, and the flesh of the dugong, dried and jerked, ‘boucané’ (whence the term ‘buccaneer’ is derived). The vessel must have been of some capacity in order to hold the eight exiles, with their chests, bedding, barrel of water, and provision for several days.

They were too impatient to await the expiration of the two years, within which period a ship had been promised to come to their relief, and it was determined to make the attempt as soon as everything was in readiness. Taking advantage of the high tide at full moon, the little expedition started on April 19, 1693. The leader alone was haunted with misgivings, which were speedily fulfilled. At the very outset the boat struck against a rock and sprang a leak; the water poured in, and fortunate it was for them that their one sailor was able to put the boat about and steer within the reef again, for the boat quickly filled with water and sank at some distance from the coast, but where it was shallow enough for them to wade ashore. They were able with difficulty to land most of their effects, but the violent exertion under a hot sun and the chill superinduced by exposure and wet clothes at night caused one of their number, Isaac Boyer, to succumb to an attack of fever shortly after his accident, and François Leguat composed a characteristic epitaph in honour of his deceased comrade.

This first shipwreck furnished Leguat with an opportunity for using all his arguments to dissuade his brethren from again tempting fortune by a second attempt to leave the island; but his sage advice fell upon deaf ears. The boat was reconstructed, and, taught by their unsuccessful experiment, the exiles carefully explored and buoyed the channel of exit between the reefs. Leguat, having exhausted his arguments in vain, employed himself by composing a long-winded *Benedicite* by way of farewell to the home of their self-imposed exile, which he deeply regretted. His anticipations of coming evil were to be fully realised, but not, as he prognosticated, from dangers by sea. On May 21 the boat was again launched, and this time the navigation between the reefs was successfully accomplished, and the exiles reached the open sea. Their only compass was a small magnet attached to a pocket dial, but their pilot no doubt knew that Rodriguez was directly to the windward of Mauritius and Bourbon; for, although the nearest of these islands was at least three hundred miles distant, yet the equatorial trade drift, together with the constantly prevailing trade winds, could hardly fail to carry any craft capable of hoisting anything by way of sail within sight of the high mountains of one or other of the islands within a few days. However, as it happened, they met with some of those baffling winds which at some seasons interrupt the regular trade wind, and a storm was

encountered which greatly terrified the landsmen, and which, indeed, must have been sufficiently alarming to the only sailor of the party; so that Mauritius was not sighted until the eighth day.

Mauritius at this period was still, as already stated, in possession of the Dutch, who had formed a settlement on the island in 1639. A fort had been erected by them at the south-east port, on a site now deserted, where the headquarters of the governor were fixed, as for many years after there was only a small cantonment at the head of the more commodious harbour, where the populous town of Port Louis now stands. The interior of the island was then more or less overgrown and uncultivated. In places the forest was so dense and intricate that, by Leguat's account, a former governor, M. Lamotius, who attempted to penetrate its depths, had been unable to extricate himself for four days; and from a map of the island made by Van Braam, a contemporary of Leguat, it is very evident that the Dutch were unacquainted with either the shape or extent of the island. Leguat first stayed a few weeks at Black River, an out-station to the south-west of the island, and five of his comrades went as deputies to report their arrival to the governor, who, however, came near Black River on a hunting excursion before they reached him. The refugees were ordered to proceed to the north-west port, to leave their boat there, and to go overland to Flac, where the Dutch Company's farm was established, and thence they were taken by water to Fort Frederik Hendrik. Most unfortunately for them the governor, Roelof Diodati, had reasons for viewing the newly arrived Frenchmen with suspicion. Captain Valteau, who had visited Mauritius after landing his passengers, had been threatened most unwisely by Leguat or his fellows, and he had left in the colony a bad impression of their behaviour on board his ship. Moreover, at this period the Dutch East India Company were profoundly jealous of all knowledge respecting their establishments and dealings in the Indies becoming known to other European nations. They did their utmost to keep other nations from penetrating beyond Magellan's Straits to the west, and beyond the Cape of Good Hope to the east, and it was the duty of all Dutch official authorities to maintain their monopoly, and to prevent casual arrivals, if possible, from carrying back to Europe any information that might be prejudicial to their company. Diodati no doubt considered that, were these Frenchmen, professedly the pioneers of a

large emigration scheme, ever allowed to get back to Europe and to report on the capabilities of Rodriguez and Mauritius, and particularly of the weakness of his defences on the latter island, the Marquis du Quesne might return with a large, well-organised squadron, and crowd out the Dutch by an overpowering importation of French Huguenot refugees. How weak the Dutch garrison was at Mauritius at this period may be judged from an event which happened shortly after Leguat's departure. In 1701 a piratical vessel was wrecked near Fort Frederik Hendrik, and two hundred men got safely ashore, together with twelve English and thirty Indian prisoners out of captured ships. The colonists were forced to take refuge in the fort, and the governor, Diodati, was obliged to sell them at half price the Company's packet, in order to get quit of the unwelcome visitors. It was evidently not considered wise to allow the Frenchmen their liberty, lest they should take the first opportunity of returning to Europe by some homeward-bound ship which put in for refreshment; besides, there were a number of 'maroons' and escaped convicts in the island who might combine, if properly organised under a chief, and do some mischief. A petty quarrel which occurred between one of the French party and a dependent of the governor as to the ownership of a lump of gum, alleged to be ambergris, afforded an excuse for imprisoning the foreigners, and poor Leguat, with four of his comrades, was confined upon an islet at the entrance of the harbour of the south-east haven. The particular islet, for there are several, on which the exiles were imprisoned has not been satisfactorily identified, although Leguat gives a clue in a map of the locality. The actual site of Fort Frederik Hendrik seems also doubtful. The French *créoles de Maurice* have generally taken it for granted that the Isle Marianne was the so-called *Rocher d'Exil* of Leguat; but, if the Admiralty large-scale chart of Grand Port is compared with Leguat's imperfect representation, it will be apparent that the centre of the three islets close to the entrance of the harbour most nearly agrees with that shown by Leguat—viz. Vacquoas Island, which lies between the Ile de la Passe and Fouquet's Island, on the last of which is now placed a lighthouse 84 feet high, visible at 16 miles distance.*

* Mr. William Telfair, of Mauritius, however, has pointed out that this Vacquoas Island is a mere rock, and that Marianne Island must be considered the northern one of the group, in which case Fouquet's

Here the innocent Frenchmen were treated with such inhuman severity that it seems as if Diodati hoped they would die, and thus spare him any further trouble as to their disposal; but, in spite of exposure, hard fare, and severe illness, they not only managed to live, but were able to escape several times to the mainland. One of their number, however, was drowned in renewing a desperate attempt to get to shore from the reef. After three years of much suffering and endurance, their pitiable case having become known in Holland, orders were sent for their removal to Batavia, the headquarters of the Dutch East India Company, and an inquiry into the circumstances of their detention was held; but no redress was obtainable. Pierre Thomas and Anselin had entered the Dutch Company's service at Mauritius on first arriving, and another died after reaching Batavia, so that the sole survivors of the original party were three—Leguat, Bénelle, and De la Case—who at last left Java in the Holland fleet, and reached the Cape in time to hear that the Peace of Ryswick had been concluded and signed.

Whilst the fleet, which suffered severely from the effects of a storm encountered on entering Table Bay, remained at anchor, Leguat had the gratification of being able to visit the flourishing Huguenot colony of Drakenstein, some little distance from Cape Town, which had been founded ten years previously—1688. The Directors of the Dutch Company, when they encouraged the immigration to South Africa of the Huguenots, hoped that they would supply the technical knowledge which the Dutch colonists lacked in various industries, such as the manufacture of wine, and brandy, and oil, and the cultivation of vines and olives; at the same time, care was taken that such occupations were not to be pursued to the neglect of the more important industries of growing wheat and rearing cattle.*

How different the Dutch Cape colony of two hundred years ago was from the modern surroundings of Cape Town of the present day, can be imagined from the following:—

‘Quelques années avant que nous arrivassions au Cap, un Lion de monstrueuse grandeur avoit sauté dans un enclos de murailles, assez près du Fort; et après avoir étranglé un Beuf, il l'avoit emporté

Island, where the lighthouse now stands, would fulfil the conditions, and correspond most nearly with the place where Leguat was imprisoned.

* See ‘Cape Quarterly Review,’ April 1882, p. 388.

presque tout entier sur la Montagne de la Table; je dis presque, parce que je n'oserois écrire ici, ce que tout le monde m'a très positivement affirmé, qu'il l'avoit emporté tout entier. Le lendemain, on fut à la chasse de ce furieux Lion, et on lui tendit un piège, où il fut pris et tué. J'ai vu sa peau qui est attachée au plancher du Corps de garde par où on passe pour entrer dans le Fort. On y conserve la peau d'un autre Lion qui fut trouvé mort, ayant trois pointes de l'orc-épic dans le corps.'

This last statement of Leguat is particularly interesting, as its accuracy is confirmed by a well-established authority, François Valentyn,* who was a Dutch clergyman, who several times visited the Cape—in 1685, 1695, 1705, and 1714—and whose great work on the Dutch possessions in the Indies was compiled from official information, and published eighteen years after Leguat's book appeared. This author states in one place that a couple of lion's skins hung in the gateway of the castle, and in another paragraph he writes: 'In de poort van't Fort hangt het vel van een swaaren Leeuw, door een egel met 5 pennen dooregen.'

After leaving the Cape the Hollanders' fleet touched at St. Helena, which then belonged to the English (having been retaken from the Dutch, by Sir Richard Munden, twenty-five years previously), and received hospitable treatment from the then governor, Captain Stephen Poirier, and finally the much-harassed adventurers put their feet on European ground, at Flessingue, on June 28, 1698, seven months after leaving Batavia; and the whole course of their travels, as Leguat tells us, had occupied eight years, wanting twelve days. Here Leguat's story ends; but we gather from internal evidence, and other sources, that the comrades must have separated soon after landing. De la Case apparently emigrated to America, Bénelle returned to his father at Amsterdam, and François Leguat came over to England, where, ten years after his return from the Indies, his narrative was published in French and English in London by David Mortier.

The mere fact that the author was a Huguenot sufficed to prejudice the contemporary opinion of the merits of the book in Catholic France, where the story was generally regarded as an extravagant and fabulous distortion of facts; but in England, Holland, and Germany the work met with a more favourable reception. Nevertheless, from the first,

* 'Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop, met de Zaaken daar toe behoorende,' Amsterdam, 1726.

there existed considerable suspicion as to the real authorship of the volume, in consequence of the personal and acrimonious tone of the preface, which was attributed to various known writers. According to the 'Biographie Universelle,' Leguat's book was supposed to have been published by a renegade monk, one Frédéric-Auguste Gabillon; but M. Jacques Bernard, the successor of Pierre Bayle, in the 'Nouvelles de la République des Lettres,' made a nearer shot at the mark when he stated that 'the preface of this book is not by the author of the work,' and 'It is astonishing that a stranger's hand should thus have figured a voyage which was perfectly capable of attracting interest by the mere recital of the actual adventures of which it could have been composed.' On strict examination of the conflicting statements, it appears that Leguat's original manuscript, which went the round of his friends, was really a true account of what he had undergone and seen during his travels; but in all probability he possessed little or no literary skill or style, and his publisher must have placed it in the hands of a professional hack writer to prepare for the press. That this writer was Maximilian Misson there seems little doubt. In fact, M. Misson, who was a Huguenot by birth, and likewise a refugee in England, practically admits in a subsequent edition of his 'Nouveau Voyage d'Italie,' published a few years later, that he was the author of the preface above mentioned, and doubtless to the same pen must be attributed the many interpolations containing classical and Italian allusions which are to be found at frequent intervals throughout the body of the narrative; whilst the curious misprints in the English edition seem to indicate that the pages were corrected by a foreigner's pen. Witness the printer's errors—'variety' for 'vanity,' and 'coaches and horses' for 'clothes and houses,' &c., which could hardly have escaped the notice of an English writer. It has been suggested also that, as Ozell assisted Misson in the translation of his Italian voyage, he may have in this case also have translated the voyage of Leguat; but the errors alluded to seem to militate against this supposition. Taking this for granted, that the hand of a practised author has assisted in putting together the materials of the book, it may be also assumed as certain that the substantive facts of the narrative, as well as the close observations of natural objects that impressed him as strange and notable, his descriptions of topography, of scenery, of buildings, and of the habits and customs of the

various nationalities met with in the course of his travels—all these, it may be maintained, were faithfully delineated by him, and his notes thereon form trustworthy records which are valuable documentary evidence of the state of things which the author saw two hundred years ago. Leguat remained in England after writing his book, which brought him into some notice, and during his old age he became acquainted with Baron Haller, who visited England in 1727, and Dr. Sloane, the well-known Secretary of the Royal Society. The veteran traveller lived over a quarter of a century after the publication of his travels, and his death is announced in the 'Bibliothèque Britannique' as occurring at or near London in 1735, after attaining the great age of ninety-six years. His ancient comrade, Paul Bénelle, a much younger man, some thirty years his junior, survived his chief eleven years, dying, in 1746, in the seventy-seventh year of his age.

François Leguat would doubtless have soon been forgotten had it not been that his name has since been indissolubly connected with a rare species of bird which inhabited the island of Rodriguez in his day, but which has since become totally extinct. The Mascarene Islands, as Alfred Wallace has shown in his 'Island Life,' belong to an undoubtedly oceanic group, being of volcanic formation, surrounded by abysmal depths of the Indian Ocean. The two largest, about one hundred miles apart, are mountainous and evidently of great antiquity, the highest peak in Réunion being 9,000 feet above the sea-level, whilst the loftiest summit in Mauritius is under 3,000 feet in altitude. The smaller and more remote island of Rodriguez has, besides, a good deal of coralline rock, an indication of partial submergence. It stands on a 100-fathom bank of considerable extent, beyond which the ocean rapidly deepens to more than 2,600 fathoms. None of these islands possesses either indigenous mammals or amphibia; but at the date when the Portuguese navigators first landed there, they were inhabited by a special fauna, very remarkable—by the great wingless and short-winged birds, unknown, and, indeed, altogether unlike anything found elsewhere on the globe; by gigantic land tortoises, by saurians, and by many other terrestrial animals, which could not have arrived there across almost fathomless abysses of the wide distance of ocean separating them from the nearest continents, and which lived there in extraordinarily great numbers. This zoological population—so rich, so varied, and yet so peculiar—does not seem as if it could have

been evolved on islands of so restricted an extent, and M. Alphonse Milne-Edwards, the eminent naturalist, has been led to believe that the Mascarene Islands must be looked upon as the surviving remains of a lost continent, whose inhabitants, before completely disappearing from the surface of the world, have found a refuge on the culminating points of mountain ridges, whose foundations have now sunk below the level of the Indian Ocean.

The best known of these large apterous and brevipennate ground-birds, quite incapable of flight, and which have become totally extinct within the last two hundred years, was the Dodo, which inhabited Mauritius, whilst allied species lived in Bourbon or Réunion and Rodriguez, of which one was for a long time only known from Leguat's descriptions and figure, and hence named Leguat's *Solitaire*.

The existence of good and rare fowls on the island of Rodriguez when Leguat resided there has already been alluded to. Before disembarkation, indeed, the worthy Huguenot had become acquainted with the taste of this and its congeners, for Captain Vallean, on first landing there, returned in the evening, bringing back some game:—

‘Il est vrai qu’il apporta diverses sortes d’oiseaux gras et bons, cela étoit réellement vrai, et je fis un agréable repas de ces mets nouveaux et inconnus.’

Leguat gives a detailed description of this bird, with its peculiar characteristics and habits, which could only have been drawn from minute observations of the animal, which, until a comparatively short time back, was almost entirely known to the world by the very circumstantial testimony of Leguat, who first named it, and who gave it its name for the following reason:—

‘De tous les oiseaux de cette isle l’espèce la plus remarquable est celle à laquelle on a donné le nom de Solitaires, parce qu’on les voit rarement en troupes, quoiqu’il y en a beaucoup.’

Now M. Carré, who had visited the neighbouring island of Bourbon about thirty years previously, in 1668,* has left the description of a somewhat similar bird, which the inhabitants named *Poiseau Solitaire*, and of which we find another account in the relation of the Sieur Du Bois, who stayed in the same island in 1669†; but it does not appear that Leguat identified the bird he found at Rodriguez with that

* M. Carré, ‘Voyage des Indes Orientales.’ 2 vols., 1699.

† D.B. ‘Voyage à Madagascar.’ Paris, 1674.

described by MM. Carré and Du Bois as living in Bourbon, nor, indeed, does he quote either of these travellers, mentioning only the book of Mr. Dellon and the brochure of Du Quesne when alluding to Bourbon.

Leguat proceeds:—

‘Les mâles ont le plumage ordinairement grisâtre et brun, les pieds de coq d’Inde et le bec aussi, mais un peu plus crochu. Ils n’ont presque point de queue, et leur derrière couvert de plumes est arrondi comme une croupe de cheval. Ils sont plus haut montés que les coqs d’Inde, et ont le cou droit, un peu plus long, à proportion, que ne l’a cet oiseau quand il leve la tête. L’œil noir et vif, et la tête sans crête ni huppe. Ils ne volent point, leurs ailes sont trop petites pour soutenir le poids de leurs corps. Ils ne s’en servent que pour se battre, et pour faire le moulinet quand ils veulent s’appeller l’un l’autre.’

This expression, ‘faire le moulinet,’ has been rendered familiar to English readers by Sir Walter Scott, who, when describing the bout of quarter-staves between the Miller and Gurth at Ashby-de-la-Zouche, in ‘Ivanhoe,’ writes:—

‘The Miller, on the other hand, holding his quarter-staff by the middle and making it flourish round his head after the fashion which the French call “Faire le moulinet,” exclaimed. . . .’

Mr. Edward Westermarck, in his ‘History of Human Marriage,’* has found primitive traces of marriages among the Chelonia, and he declares that a more or less durable connexion between male and female, lasting beyond the mere act of propagation, and till after the birth of the offspring, is almost universal among birds. Leguat has some curious remarks to make on this subject as regards the Solitaire; he writes:—

‘Après que ces oiseaux ont élevé leur petit et l’ont abandonné à lui-même, ils ne se départent pas comme font tous les autres, mais ils demeurent toujours unis et compagnons, quoi qu’ils aillent quelquefois se mêler parmi d’autres de leur espèce. Nous avons souvent remarqué que quelques jours après que le jeune étoit sorti du nid, une compagnie de trente ou quarante en amenoient un autre jeune, et que le nouveau déniché avec ses père et mère, se joignant à la bande, s’en alloient dans un lieu écarté. Comme nous les suivions souvent, nous voyions qu’après cela, les vieux se retiroient chacun de leur côté, ou seuls ou couple à couple, et laissoient les deux jeunes ensemble; et nous appellions cela un mariage’ (p. 102).

Buffon, who gives full credit to Leguat as an eye-witness and a particularly accurate observer, was unable to believe

* ‘History of Human Marriage,’ by Edward Westermarck, Lecturer on Sociology at the University of Finland, Helsingfors, 1891.

in this somewhat apocryphal story of a marriage ceremony ; but then neither would he believe in the stone which Leguat states was always found within the bird, and this remarkable fact of the stone has received confirmation in recent investigations, which we shall presently proceed to notice.

After the island of Rodriguez had been deserted by the unfortunate Leguat and his comrades, it appears to have attracted the notice of the English, who sent some officers to examine the anchorage of Port Mathurin in 1706 or 1707, and this determined the Government of Bourbon, which had already taken possession of Mauritius in 1715, to occupy Rodriguez Island, which occupation took place in 1725. A curious report which was drawn up by some French official, about 1730, gives a full description of the island about this period (before the final disappearance of the *Solitaire*), from which it appears that, apart from the quantity of tortoises found there, the island was considered of little use to the French East India Company. The Abbé Pingré, who was sent to Rodriguez to observe the transit of Venus in 1761, states :—

‘The island of Rodriguez is generally inhabited only by a French officer, who commands a dozen or fifteen blacks, whose principal occupation is to catch the tortoises in the different parts of the island : they collect these tortoises in a pack, and send them to the Isle of France on the corvettes, which they dispatch from time to time for this cargo. . . . When the Governor of the Isle de France sends a corvette to load up with tortoises, he sends at the same time a provision of rice, sufficing for the maintenance of the colony.’

Captain (afterwards Admiral) Kempenfelt surveyed Port Mathurin in the same year, and landed his men, but the mortality was so great that he soon re-embarked them. Rodriguez remained of little consequence until the beginning of the present century, when Captain Rowley established a depôt there for the supply of the cruisers which were employed in 1809 in blockading Mauritius and Bourbon. Rodriguez was made the base of operations, where General Abercrombie’s force assembled preparatory to its attack on Mauritius in 1810, and since the capture of that colony little has been heard of the insignificant dependency.

Indeed, the only interest in the island has been felt by scientific naturalists, who too late viewed with regret the total destruction and extinction of the greater proportion of the unique fauna and flora which existed in the olden days when Leguat and his companions resided there. Nevertheless, among the Mauritian colonists were several men of

advanced ideas, who formed a Society of Natural History as early as 1829 at Port Louis, and at the request of this Society M. Eudes commenced excavations in the earthy deposits within the limestone caverns of Rodriguez, and this gentleman succeeded in unearthing the bones of a bird larger than any which had been seen in the island. These bones, after having been exhibited by M. Cuvier in Paris, were submitted to Mr. Strickland, the president of the Ashmolean Society, and Dr. Melville, by whom they were compared with the remains of the Dodo in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. The reconstruction of the ideal skeleton from these fragments showed that the species to which they belonged was unquestionably allied to, although not identical with, the Dodo, and it was rightly assumed that they belonged to the species described and figured (or rather caricatured) by Leguat as the Solitaire. Moreover, it was ascertained by these eminent naturalists that the points of agreement between these two extinct species were shared in common with pigeons, and existed in no other known species of bird.

In 1848 appeared the well-known monograph on the Dodo and its kindred, in which the structure and habits of the Solitaire were discussed, and the name *Pezophaps Solitarius* bestowed on it. A smaller species, *Pezophaps minor*, was determined four years subsequently.

In 1864, Mr. Edward Newton, then Auditor-General in Mauritius, visited Rodriguez, and found in a cave some more bones of *Pezophaps*. Mr. Newton urged Mr. Jenner, the magistrate of the island, to make a thorough search of the caves, and in 1865 this gentleman sent no less than eighty-one specimens to Mauritius. On the news of this find reaching England, the British Association was prompted by Mr. P. K. Selater, of the Zoological Society, to make a grant in aid of further research, and in 1866 a very large collection of the bones of this bird, amounting to nearly two thousand specimens, was obtained by Mr. Jenner for Mr. Newton, and forwarded to Cambridge, where Professor Alfred Newton and his brother succeeded, after an infinity of pains, in making an admirable and nearly perfect restoration of the skeleton of the long-lost Solitaire. The extraordinary fidelity of François Leguat's former observations of the structure and habits of the bird was fully confirmed.

Leguat has written :—

‘L’os de l’aïleron grossit à l’extrémité, et forme sous la plume une petite masse ronde comme une balle de mousquet ; cela et le bec, sont la principale défense de cet oiseau.’

And Professor Newton states :—

‘In *Pezophaps* the bones of the wing are more massive and smother than in *Didus*. The most remarkable thing about them, however, is the presence of a bony knob on the radial side of the metacarpal, unlike what is found in any other bird. It is large in some of the specimens supposed to have belonged to old males, but very little developed in the presumed females. It is more or less spherical, pedunculate, and consists of a callus-like mass with a roughened surface, exceedingly like that of a diseased bone, and was probably covered by a horny integument. It is situated immediately beyond the proximal end and the index, which last would appear to be thrust away by it to some extent. It answers most accurately and most unexpectedly to Leguat’s description of it.’

When the British Government despatched scientific expeditions to observe the transit of Venus in 1874, a party of naturalists accompanied the astronomers who were stationed at Rodriguez at the request of the Royal Society. Dr. W. Bayley Balfour found Leguat’s tempting picture of the forests and perennial verdure of his earthly paradise entirely changed in character and aspect. The great and tall trees had almost entirely disappeared; the eternally verdant canopy formed by their boughs no longer existed, and the ‘little Eden’ was, alas! now a dry and comparatively barren spot, clothed with a vegetation mainly composed of weeds and destitute of any forest growth save in unfrequented and more inaccessible recesses of the valleys.

The causes which wrought this distressing change and destroyed the peculiar and most interesting flora of the once fertile island, effectually altering its character and aspect, were most evident. Goats, introduced long ago, are still found in enormous numbers eating the young shoots and leaves of any herb, shrub, or tree within their reach, whilst several thousand head of cattle graze on the island, and effectually keep down the vegetation of the spots they frequent. Then, again, the foreign plants introduced by human agency are now in great abundance, and in many cases occupy the ground to the exclusion of the native vegetation, which is driven to the secluded parts of the island; and, finally, a certain amount of destructive influence is attributable to the settlers indiscriminately cutting down the trees over large tracts. These several agencies have directly effected the destruction of a great part of the vegetation of the island, so that over large areas hardly a tree or shrub is seen, and the ground is covered by only a scanty clothing of grass and tropical weeds. ² But fires and

the hand of man, through the alteration of the climate consequent on their destruction of the forests, have effected indirectly a more permanent injury on the flora; for now we have a bare, parched volcanic pile, with deep stream courses for the most part dry, in place of the verdant well-watered island of two hundred years ago.

Professor Balfour was enabled, however, to identify many of the plants described, rather curtly, by Leguat, whose favourable description is amply verified; for instance:—

‘That the soil of the island is good, and that water was formerly abundant, the fact of so many plants being cultivated clearly proves; but at the same time their cultivation must have acted prejudicially on the indigenous vegetation.’

Mr. Henry H. Slater, who was especially deputed to search for bones of the Solitaire and other extinct remains, found the cave tract on the south-west side of the island to be of a very curious nature. The caves are situated in some remarkable coralline limestone patches which have been upheaved by the basalt beneath them, and which have been much enlarged by subterranean watercourses. The cave earth seems to have been partly washed in and partly blown in in the form of dust:—

‘The depth of the bone earth is very variable; in some caves we find it with a depth of from six inches to three feet, in others, however, it varies from four to nine feet in depth. Below, about two feet, I never found many bones, which makes me believe that the agency which deposited the bones in the caverns never operated until the later days of the existence of the Solitaire. The bones might certainly have decayed, but yet I usually found that the bones which were well covered with earth were in much better preservation than those near or upon the surface, which were usually much decayed. This makes me think that the Solitaire resorted to the caverns in case of fire in the island, which has been known to have denuded it several times of its trees; more so, as in several cases I found nearly perfect skeletons, which lay evidently as they died; this precludes the idea that they were carried there by wild cats. Again, in the bottom of a cleft near the mouth of a cave, I found the greater part of the skeletons of a male and female Solitaire; they had clearly fallen in and were unable to extricate themselves, but, the bones being but imperfectly covered, many bones were so much decayed as to prevent their removal. But I could not doubt that they arrived there alive, and if not driven into the neighbouring hole as a shelter under some alarm, what could have allured them there? Nor were any bones found in the caves at any distance from the mouths; at least, if they were, they were single, and looked as if they had been washed there.’

Leguat, however, had remarked how the Solitaires and other animals were wont to take refuge in the caves during

the violent hurricanes which were wont to rage during certain months of the hot season in those latitudes:—

‘Les animaux, par un instinct naturel que leur a donné la bonne et sage Providence, prévoient ces orages avant qu’ils arrivent, et se sauvent dans les trous des montagnes; mais dès le lendemain ils paroissent comme auparavant, parce que le temps redevient aussi beau et aussi calme que jamais.’

Allusion has already been made to the stone alleged to have been swallowed by the Solitaire. Leguat’s account runs as follows:—

‘On leur trouve toujours dans le gésier (aussi bien qu’aux mâles) une pierre brune de la grosseur d’un Œuf de poule; elle est un peu raboteuse, plate, d’un côté et arrondie de l’autre, fort pesante, et fort dure. Nous avons jugé que cette pierre naît avec eux; parce que quelques jeunes qu’ils soient, ils en ont toujours, et n’en ont jamais qu’une, et qu’outre cela, le canal qui va du jabot au gésier est trop étroit de moitié pour donner passage à une pareille masse. Nous nous en servions préférablement à aucune autre pierre, pour aiguïser nos couteaux.’

Mr. Slater was unable to find any of these stones, but Mr. Caldwell, of Mauritius, who visited Rodriguez shortly afterwards, was more fortunate, and succeeded in obtaining three of what he believes to be the stones mentioned by Leguat. One of these stones was exhibited to the Zoological Society in 1873, and is now in the Museum of Zoology and Anatomy at Cambridge.

Enough has been said to show that Leguat’s story of his voyage and adventures was not the *tissu de fables* for which it was long taken in France, as Pingré informs us. But Leguat’s editor or publisher certainly gave a handle to the calumniators of that author by illustrating the book with cuts taken from various unacknowledged sources, which gave rise to grave suspicions as to the Huguenot traveller’s truthfulness. For instance, Leguat mentions the existence of a very strange bird at Mauritius, of an unknown gigantic species, which no other author has mentioned as existing in that island, except Valentyn, and there seems to be every reason for supposing that this last-named historian derived his information from Leguat himself. Describing the birds of Mauritius, Leguat writes:—

‘On voit de grandes volées de Butors, et beaucoup de certains oiseaux qu’on appelle Géans, parce que leur tête s’élève à la hauteur d’environ six pieds. Ils sont extrêmement haut montez, et ont le cou fort long. Le corps n’est pas plus gros que celui d’une Oye. Ils sont tous blancs, excepté un endroit sous l’aile qui est un peu rouge. Ils

ont un bec d'oye, mais un peu plus pointu; ses doits des pieds separez, et forts longs. Ils paissent dans les lieux marécageux, et les Chiens les surprennent souvent, à cause qu'il leur faut beaucoup de temps pour s'élever de terre. Nous en vîmes un jour à Rodrigue, et nous le prîmes à la main, tant il étoit gras; c'est le seul que nous y avons remarqué; ce qui me fait croire qu'il y avoit été poussé par quelque vent à la force duquel il n'avoit pu résister. Ce gibier est assez bon.'

Leguat also mentions *les Géans* among the birds of Bourbon, taking his information from Du Quesne,* who wrote in 1689 of the river birds of that island:—

'Les meilleurs sont ceux que quelques uns appellent des Géans parce qu'ils sont hauts comme des hommes à cause de l'extrême longueur de leurs cols et de leurs jambes, ils ont le corps comme un oye, le plumage blanc, et noir au bout des ailes, la chair en est rouge et fort délicate.' †

Mr. Strickland supposed these *Géans* to have been flamingoes,‡ but Dr. Hamel conjectured them to be struthious birds,§ whilst Professor Schegel has placed it among the water-hens, and classified it as *Gallinula (Leguatia) gigantea*.|| None of these ornithologists, however, had detected what Professor Alfred Newton has more recently pointed out, that the figure of the *Giant* used to illustrate Leguat's description was merely the copy of an old copperplate engraving of a bird, drawn by Adrian Collaert, in the previous century, most likely from nature, under the name of *Avis indica*, apparently representing some species of Indian crane, and which, judging from the ducks placed close to it, would have been nothing like six French feet in height. Doubtless many of Leguat's scientific contemporaries must have at once recognised the source of this particular illustration, and judged that his account of the bird was only a repetition of Duquesne's remarks on the bird of Bourbon, whilst it was also evident that his figure was not original;

* 'Un Projet de République.' M. Sauzier's reprint. Leguat's quotation is 'Les Géans sont de grands Oiseaux montez sur des échasses, qui fréquentent les Rivières & des Lacs, & dont la chair est à-peu-près du goût de celle du Butor' (p. 56, French edition).

† Du Quesne, however, seems to have taken his account of these *Géans* from the so-called 'Flamands' of the Sieur Du Bois, who visited Bourbon in 1671, and who mentions these said flamingoes as occurring also in Madagascar.

‡ 'Dodo and its Kindred,' pp. 60-61.

§ 'Der Dodo die Einsiedler und der erdichtete Nazarvogel,' quoted by Mr. Strickland.

|| 'Journal für Ornithologie,' 1858; and 'Ibis,' new series, vol. i. pp. 146-168.

and then on examining the other illustrations, which in all number some twenty or thirty, it would be equally conspicuous that they were merely reproductions of plates taken from other works published not many years previously, and indeed selected, at least as regards locality, somewhat at random. Some we find extracted from Father Tachard's 'Voyage de Siam,' but the majority, if not all, of the plants are taken without acknowledgement from M. de Rochefort's well-known 'Histoire naturelle des Iles Antilles de l'Amérique,' published in Paris before 1667. For instance, amongst other examples, we may take *Kasta* of Rodriguez, which Leguat supposes to be the banyan and yet identical with *Paretuvier* of the Antilles—i.e. the mangrove. Now in the engraving given by Leguat, vol. i. p. 87, the draughtsman employed by his publisher has inserted a porcupine and a saurian, apparently intended for an iguana or small alligator, which, at all events, had no connexion with the Rodriguez fauna, whilst the plant itself is evidently an adaptation of De Rochefort's drawing.* So also, in the copperplate of the Solitaire, behind the figure of that very queer fowl has been inserted a plant which is easily recognisable as a copy from the Calebassier, figured in the 'Natural History of the Antilles.' Similarly the bananier, the goyavier, and the acajou are all taken from De Rochefort. When it was discovered that all these illustrations of Leguat's book were adapted from well-known authors, it is not surprising that his narrative was regarded with considerable suspicion. Modern investigations, however, as we have shown, thoroughly re-establish the absolute veracity of Leguat's story, from which a valuable object lesson may be taken to heart by colonists in all tropical countries as to the danger of deforestation, and by all naturalists as to the results of uncontrolled human influence in bringing about total extinction of sedentary animal species.

'It is by comparing the sedentary fauna,' writes Mr. Milne Edwards, 'such as it is at the present day, with the species which are revealed by the bones dug out of the earth of the caves, and which Leguat observed, that it is possible to determine that, in less than two centuries, very considerable changes have taken place in the composition of this fauna, formerly so rich and now so remarkably poor. The vegetation there has changed also its character, for the fine trees of which Leguat speaks have for the most part given place to brushwood. But these modifications are not due either to a geological catastrophe

* Perhaps assisted by suggestions of the figure of the banyan given by Boullaye-le-Gouz, an author quoted by Leguat's editor.

or to special meteorological phenomena, for the climate has not varied. The local traditions attribute the destruction of the woods to great fires occasioned by human agency, and also to human influence, either direct or indirect, which seems to me to have brought about the extinction of the animal species which I have described. Leguat was one of the first who landed at Rodriguez; the aboriginal animals were there multiplying in peace, they as yet had no enemies but the rats, whose introduction, due to sailors, was probably recent, and the birds were so little shy that often they let themselves be taken by the hand. Besides the sailors of the ships which put into Rodriguez did not fail always to hunt them down. In fact, the work of destruction commenced by the sailors and by the rodents, which our ships carried everywhere, was completed without doubt when the Europeans established at Rodriguez a small colony of negro slaves, meagrely supplied. The climate of Rodriguez has not become unfavourable for the propagation of animal species, since the domestic fowls, the guinea fowls introduced by the colonists, breed well and thrive even in a wild state. The disturbance due to the presence of man seems to have sufficed to cause the disappearance from the surface of the globe of the most part of the sedentary birds to whom Rodriguez was probably the last refuge. Elsewhere man has been the cause, direct or indirect, of many other phenomena of the same order, and the influence which he has exercised upon the geographical distribution of animal species is more considerable than is generally supposed.'

In conclusion, a few words on the present inhabitants of Rodriguez may interest the readers of Leguat's narrative. Two years ago the population numbered 1,830 souls, of whom but 4 are Europeans; 1,521 appear as natives of the island, and 228 as Mauritians. The bulk of the inhabitants are classified as agriculturists, 226 as fishermen, and 150 of other callings.

The export trade seems to consist of *bambara*, whatever that may be—presumably cocoa nuts in some form—and salt fish, whilst the imports consist chiefly of rum (!) from Mauritius. An occasional inspection by the Governor of Mauritius, and visits by the ships of the East India squadron, are the only events which break the monotony of life in this out-of-the-way island. Alas that Leguat's paradise should in these more civilised days suffer from drought and famine at frequently recurring intervals!

We read:—

'Towards the end of 1880 it was evident from the long-continued droughts that the maize crops in the early part of 1881 would be a failure, and in consequence that a famine was imminent. Due report of this was made to the Mauritius Government, who at the latter end of December, 1880, sent 100 bags of rice, and in the early part of January, 1881, 300 bags more for relief purposes. The worst

fears were realised, for the crops were a total failure, and, owing to the excessive drought, nothing was obtainable from the soil for the maintenance of the hundreds of souls living upon the mountains. The rice so promptly supplied was thus the saving from starvation of a large number of the inhabitants of this island.'

Again in 1886 a disastrous hurricane occurred, followed by another drought, which is especially interesting, as it led to an open boat voyage, bearing some resemblance to that of Leguat nearly two hundred years previously. The official account is given as follows:—

'The hurricane of April last, which, within the memory of the oldest inhabitant of the place, is the severest one which ever struck this island, was followed by almost a continual drought. The state of affairs began to assume a very alarming aspect towards the month of August, when it became evident that the crops would fail. Nor was it a vain surmise. The bean harvest was not one-third of what it had been the previous year. As regards the sweet potatoes, manioc, maize, which are the staple food of the inhabitants, hardly any could be had. The stock of rice in the island being nearly exhausted at the beginning of September, and the ship being late, a meeting of the principal inhabitants took place in the Police Court Hall, at which it was resolved that a boat should be sent to Mauritius to ask for immediate relief. The Government pinnace, "Victoria," being then unfit for sea, another boat, the private property of the Civil Commissioner, was fitted up. The Government pilot, Mr. Vandorous, consented to take charge of this perilous expedition; he was assisted by Police-Sergeant Aston, by one Genève, and by one Barthelemy Prudence, who bravely volunteered to follow him. They left on the 11th September with despatches from the Civil Commissioner, and reached Mauritius after a three days' passage, during which they narrowly escaped with their lives. The gallant conduct of these men is beyond all praise. The Government of Mauritius responded quickly to the appeal of this starving population, and on the 19th September the steam tug "Stella" steamed into this harbour (*i.e.* Port Mathurin) with a cargo of 350 bags of rice. But this supply was soon exhausted. On the 21st December following, the "Hattonburn" arrived with another cargo of 1,000 bags of rice, sent by the Government to be sold to the inhabitants. A population of 1,700 souls has been saved from the dire consequences of famine owing to the prompt action taken in this matter by Sir John Pope Hennessy, and for this he cannot be too much thanked. This island is slowly recovering from the disastrous effects of the late hurricane and of the drought which followed it.'

The then acting Civil Commissioner, M. Boucherat, states that 'the sanitary condition of the island was very satisfactory, considering the circumstances mentioned above,' and adds, rather sarcastically, in a manner that would have caused Leguat to smile grimly, that 'the absence of the

‘Government medical officer from Rodriguez ever since
 ‘November last has not been too much felt.’ This last
 touch is quite after Leguat’s own heart. In the old
 Huguenot’s quaint apostrophe to the island of Rodriguez he
 wrote :—

‘Que nul honôte Larron, & Meurtrier,
 Ne se fasse jamais un obligeant métier
 D’attraper ton Argent
 En abrégant impunément les jours de tes Habitans,
 Après les avoir martyrisés dans leur Lit de langueur !’

And he never fails to take every opportunity of exhibiting his aversion to all doctors of medicine, aiding his invectives by many quotations from Molière. We cannot take leave of the impoverished little island of Rodriguez and its precarious food supply, in such contrast to its ancient and indigenous prodigality of fruits, vegetables, and animals when first inhabited, without expressing our satisfaction that the Hakluyt Society has rescued from oblivion the ingenuous and true story of the long-suffering Huguenot band of adventurers under their gallant and patient leader, François Leguat.

ART. IV.—*John Lewis Mallet : An Autobiographical Retrospect of the First Twenty-five Years of his Life.* Printed for private circulation. 1890.

THIS autobiography is of the class of those which derive their chief interest from circumstances external to the life of the writer. Mr. J. L. Mallet was the son of Mallet du Pan, whose life and writings have formed the subject of two articles in this journal,* and the father of the late Sir Louis Mallet, who caused this memoir to be printed for private circulation; but his own long life was undistinguished, and, after the first few troubled years recorded in the work before us, uneventful. The great events which were in progress during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and the part played in them by Mallet du Pan, whom M. Taine considers to have been the most profound of the

* *Mémoires et Correspondance de Mallet du Pan*, par A. Sayous, 1851. See *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xcv. p. 481, April 1852.

Correspondance inédite de Mallet du Pan avec la cour de Vienne, 1794–98, publiée par André Michel, avec une préface de M. Taine, Paris, 1884. See *Edinburgh Review*, vol. clxi. p. 106, January, 1885.

four observers (the other three being Rivarol, Malouet, and Gouverneur Morris) who from the first understood the character and meaning of the French Revolution, would be enough, apart from the literary merits of the book itself, to make this memoir, with its glimpses into the home life and character of the eminent public writer, the descriptions of his friends, private and political, and the account of the stirring scenes of which Mr. Mallet was an eyewitness, one of interest to a wider circle than the family to which it is addressed; and no further excuse will be needed for this notice of its contents.

There can, as Sir Louis Mallet observes in the preface dated a few days only before his own death, be no greater contrast than that which is presented by the lives of Mallet du Pan and that of his son. The former died at the age of fifty in England, having been driven in turn from France, Switzerland, and Germany, worn out by incessant labours and anxieties, both political and domestic. His son, after sharing for a few years his father's stormy destiny, found in the same country a secure and tranquil home during the half-century which followed, and held for nearly the whole of that period an office in the English public service, to which he had been appointed by Mr. Pitt in recognition of his father's services to the cause of European freedom.

We may quote a description of Mr. Mallet's character and appearance by the hand of the late Sir Louis:—

‘That he did not play a more conspicuous part is due partly to his foreign origin, but also to circumstances of health, disposition, and character; for, as his writings show * and his friends remember, he was possessed of a keen interest in public affairs, and of a sound political judgment, combined with much literary taste and skill; while the place which he won for himself in the opinion and regard of his many friends and of a distinguished political and literary circle, shows the estimation in which he was held for his social qualities.

‘My father possessed, in common with his sister, Mme. Colladon, the quality which is only expressed by the word “distinction.” In his manner he retained much of the polished courtesy and graceful forms of the older French school; while the traces of his English training

* Mr. Mallet left about forty MS. volumes of diaries, political, social, literary, but never published anything. There are interesting notices and portraits of many persons with whom he was brought into contact, such as Sir James Mackintosh, Dumont, Cobbett, Lords Grenville, Holland, Lansdowne, Jeremy Bentham, Sir P. Francis, the Baring family, Mme. de Stael, and others; but these do not, unfortunately, fall within the period of the printed volume.

were evident in the simplicity and repose habitual to well-bred Englishmen. His extensive reading and varied tastes, the interesting experiences of his life, and the good sense and moderation of his opinions, together with his warm and ready sympathies, gave to his conversation a peculiar charm, enhanced by his refined and critical aversion to careless and slovenly forms of expression.

‘Although so unlike him in many respects, he inherited from Mallet du Pan his perfect integrity and noble independence of character. No man was ever more free from all taint of self-seeking and worldliness, or presented a happier combination of liberality and sound economy, or cultivated with greater success reasonable and moderate views of human life.’

The volume opens, as all such volumes should, with an account of the origin of the family. The words in which the writer comments on the expulsion of Mallet du Pan from Switzerland, his native country—‘to us were not given ‘peaceable habitation and the sure dwelling and the quiet ‘resting-place’—are descriptive of much of the family history of the Mallets. According to an old tradition—‘idle inquiries,’ says Mr. Mallet, ‘for a plain gentleman,’ but interesting, nevertheless, from its curiously circumstantial character—the first of the family, a ‘cadet de famille,’ from Poitou, went on the second Crusade in 1147, settled at Antioch under the Christian prince, and married there, receiving as a surname the name of Mallet. Three of his descendants escaped at the fall of Antioch in 1268, and lived some years at Constantinople, thence coming to Marseilles. One of them, Alexis Mallet, then settled at Rouen, and was the ancestor of Jean Mallet, who married a certain Marguerite de Jeux in 1530, and had a son Jacques. In his person begin the historical wanderings of the family. In 1558, at the time of the troubles preceding the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, Jacques Mallet, a Huguenot clothier of Rouen, left France and settled at Geneva, in order to enjoy the free exercise of the Protestant faith. In 1566 he was received by a *lettre de bourgeoisie* into the first rank of the freemen of the city—he and his children, ‘et les enfans de ‘ses enfans nés et à naître, naturels et légitimes, jusqu’à ‘l’infini.’ He had ten children, and in the course of two centuries 170 persons of the name were born in Geneva, and their prosperity is attested by the erection in the middle of the seventeenth century of one of the handsomest houses in Geneva, the Maison Mallet in the Cour de St. Pierre. Although, in the words of the Genevese chronicle, ‘riche ‘et très bien alliée,’ they produced only two ‘conseillers,’ but they were represented continuously in the ‘Council of

‘ the Two Hundred ’ and were distinguished by several men of literary eminence. Various members of the family returned at different times to France, where their descendants now form its most numerous and prosperous branch.

Mr. Mallet’s account of his grandparents brings the story down to Mallet du Pan.

‘ My grandfather, Etienne Mallet, was brought up to the Church, and I have always heard him mentioned as a man of good understanding, mild, agreeable manner, and some talents as a preacher. He was exemplary in his pastoral and social duties, and for some years of his life, and I believe at the time of his death, was minister at Celigny, where he was remembered, even in my time, with feelings of affectionate respect. The aristocracy of Geneva was not then exempt from the overbearing disposition natural to the aristocracy of every country ; and some of them, who had country seats at Celigny, were not popular with the peasantry. My grandfather, on the contrary, was uniformly affable and kind to all ; and was sometimes taken to task by his neighbours for his condescension and popular manners.

‘ My grandfather married Mademoiselle du Pan, of one of the oldest magisterial families. My great grandfather du Pan was first Syndic of the Republic, and I have often heard an anecdote of him which is characteristic of the simplicity of manners of that time. A French envoy, who had been lately appointed, on coming to pay his first visit of ceremony to the Syndic, found him just returned from the Council, and seated by his kitchen fire, in his wig and sword, eating *briselets* (a sort of crisp cake), hot and hot, as fast as they could be made ; and as the old chimney-mantel admitted of several persons being seated under it, the old gentleman invited the minister to take a chair and partake of his collation.

‘ My grandmother had been handsome : even in her advanced age she had great remains of beauty ; a good person ; regular and delicate features and complexion ; her manners were gentle and graceful ; but the high spirit broke forth when roused by anything unbecoming. She was a strictly religious person, and had no indulgence for the loose opinions and manners that began to prevail in her time. My grandfather’s circumstances were narrow, and as his father, who lived to the age of 87, survived him six years, his chief dependence was on his living of Celigny and his wife’s fortune, which was small. His income could not have exceeded 300*l.* a year.’

The son of the couple thus described, Jacques, afterwards well known as Mallet du Pan, was born in 1749, distinguished himself greatly in his classes, and obtained every prize at the public school. A youth of his ardent turn of mind was not likely to remain long unconcerned in the conflict of opinions which made Geneva at that time a great training ground for politics. The constitutional history of Geneva

deserves a closer study than it is the fashion to give to it, and the struggle between classes which convulsed the miniature State for twenty years before the French Revolution formed a fruitful preparation for one who was to play a leading part in the greater drama. The population of Geneva was divided into three political classes: (1) the citizens or burghers, who enjoyed political rights and were both electors and alone eligible for public employments; (2) the *natifs*, or sons of inhabitants who had not been admitted to the freedom of the city, and who continued generation after generation to be excluded from all political privileges; and (3) inhabitants or strangers settled at Geneva. The *natifs* became in the course of time by far the most numerous class, and, as they increased in number and intelligence, grew more and more impatient of their position. Hence arose the contests of 1768, 1769, and 1770.

‘The exclusion of the natives from the exercise of certain branches of trade, and also from holding commissions in the town militia, exasperated them in the highest degree, and led to acts of open hostility, which ended in the banishment of some of the most distinguished of them. My father’s family and connexions were all on the aristocratic side, some of his nearest relatives being members of the government; but the same generous feeling, although in a different direction, which many years afterwards enlisted his talents on the side of an oppressed minority in France, induced him in the year 1770, when hardly of age, to embrace the popular side at Geneva. It required no little strength of character and political courage, situated as he was, to quit his natural ranks; and, disregarding the prejudices and pride of opinion of his family and friends, to advocate those higher principles of freedom now generally acknowledged, but which were at variance with the policy and practice both of ancient and modern republics.’

He published a violent pamphlet, and his action gained for him the friendship and patronage of Voltaire, who took much notice of him and asked him frequently to Ferney.

‘My father having gone one morning to Ferney to breakfast, and being in Voltaire’s bedroom, M. Fabri de Gex came in with an artist of his acquaintance, whom he wished to introduce to Voltaire. The artist was attended by a dog that followed him into the room, and who, brushing by the chimney, knocked down the tongs and shovel, to the great annoyance of Voltaire, who, violently pulling the bell, said to the footman who came in, “Lavigne, send up one of my carriage-horses to keep company with this gentleman’s dog.” Voltaire used to say that it was a very agreeable circumstance to live under a government of which the sovereigns requested you to send your carriage for them when you asked them to dinner. In a letter from my uncle Mallet he

says, "Voltaire désirait attacher ton père à la secte Encyclopédique; mais ce dernier avait des principes religieux, et s'y refusa. Voltaire ne s'intéressa pas moins à lui, et avant été prié par le Landgrave de Hesse-Cassel de lui procurer un Professeur de Belles-Lettres, il fit choix de ton père et le fit agréer au Landgrave; et quoiqu'il fût vite dégoûté de son poste, Voltaire ne lui en sut point mauvais gré."

After the episode of Cassel came his marriage with Mlle. Vallier of Aubonne, a marriage opposed to the wishes of his family, who wished him to marry at Geneva, where his talents and connexion might have procured him an advantageous match. This marriage necessitated some regular employment, and Mallet du Pan became associated with Linguet in conducting a periodical work, the '*Annales politiques et littéraires*.'

Mr. Mallet's recollections of his childhood (he was born in 1775), if we except a charming description of Aubonne, are not of special interest, and we may turn at once to the migration of the family to Paris, whither Mallet du Pan, who had been much disgusted by the proceedings of the year 1782, in which he had on the occasion of the armed intervention of France, Savoy, and Berne been charged with the part of mediator, had betaken himself, accepting an offer from the great Paris bookseller Pancoucke to undertake the editorship of the political part of the '*Mercure de France*.' In Paris, in the Rue de Tournon, near the Luxembourg, the boy was brought up from his seventh to his twelfth year with his family; they had no natural connexion or acquaintance at Paris, and their life at first was altogether domestic.

'My father as a man of letters had access to a large and distinguished circle, but he availed himself very sparingly of this advantage. His life was laborious; he took regular exercise, and had but little leisure for the literary and fashionable *coteries* of Paris, the moral atmosphere of which was not congenial to his tastes and habits. Educated with simplicity, and under the influence of moral feelings, he looked with no favourable eye on the luxurious and loose course of life of the higher classes in Paris, and was perhaps too much inclined to treat with contempt the philosophical pretensions of the drawing-rooms. He had been accustomed at Geneva to great freedom of opinion and speech, and wanted that easy and graceful acquiescence which can alone make us acceptable guests at the tables of the great. My father likewise laboured under some disadvantages in his intercourse with the men of letters of Paris; for, independently of his being a sort of intruder in that field, where many of them reaped a harvest of pensions and laurels, they did not see without jealousy one of their most valuable literary stalls filled by a stranger; nor did the earnestness of his opinions harmonise with the general tone of French conversation. A better school of opinion prevailed at that time than when Diderot and

d'Holbach's parties reigned supreme. Suard and Marmontel were moderate and reasonable men; but the "Encyclopédie" was still high on the horizon, and a young Genevese who ventured to dispute its decisions was not likely to meet with much indulgence.'

In the following remarks it is easy to see already the liberal constitutional critic of the Revolution.

'Nor was my father more fortunate in his politics; for he was shocked on the one hand with the levity of the people, the profligacy of the higher classes, the arbitrary tone and measures of the government, and, on the other, did not see without surprise and fearful anticipations those searching questions which arose out of the American War brought to the bar of every drawing-room. The manner in which these questions were discussed, and the opinions which generally prevailed on political subjects, were so much at variance with the government *de facto*, and the demoralised state of society: so inconsistent with everything *that was*, that my father, although born a Republican, and sensitively alive to the blessings of freedom, often found himself checking that spirit of indiscriminate innovation which seemed ready to break through all restraints. His notes on passing events, from 1785 to 1793, confirm the impressions generally entertained of the low estimate in which the French Government was held at the period immediately preceding the Revolution, and its apparent unconsciousness of the contempt in which it was held. The court and ministers went on with their worn-out machinery, interfering in every way with the press, with courts of justice, and private rights; issuing *Lettres de Cachet*, and bold enough against individuals, but wavering and irresolute in all measures of real moment; distributing pensions and gratuities to literary men, almost all engaged in pulling down the old fabric: and on the eve of a revolution, so pregnant with calamities, the people apparently as light-hearted as in the gayest times of the monarchy. Gluck and Piccini, Cagliostro, and the "Mariage de Figaro," successively engrossing the public mind!'

For a writer who entertained upon many great questions both of home and foreign politics opinions altogether at variance with those of the Government, the censorship of the press was, it may be imagined, a very galling yoke.

'A political writer was at that time a considerable person at Paris, and my father's talents and independence insured him public distinction of some sort or other. The "Mercure" consisted of a literary part and a political part. The literary part was written by men of considerable talent: Marmontel, La Harpe, Chamfort. My father was the only editor of the political part, which was of inferior importance so long as the government exercised a strict censure over all political opinions; for, careless as they were to the publication of the "Encyclopédie," Rousseau's and Diderot's works, Raynal's "History of the Indies," and the many able publications in which the principles of religion, morals, government, were eloquently and fearlessly discussed, the French Ministry watched a newspaper paragraph,

or the announcement of the most insignificant piece of intelligence, with the most jealous eye. Even within a few months of the Revolution and of those political convulsions which laid the whole fabric of government prostrate, the Abbé Auger, censor of the "*Mercure*," went on with an unsparing hand, cutting up my father's manuscript, suppressing his remarks on the affairs of Holland, and even simple statements of fact, such as the King of Prussia's death and a notice of the publication of Necker's "*Mémoire Justificatif*."

'On the occasion of some article on the affairs of Holland having been suppressed, M. de Vergennes, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, sent to my father an article written in the sense of the court to insert in lieu of his own, upon which my father hastened to Versailles, requested an immediate interview, and observed that the notice he had received was, in other words, an order to relinquish his literary labours, and that he came to resign the "*Mercure*.'" Struck with this spirit of independence in a man whose subsistence depended on his pen, Vergennes, with praiseworthy feelings, seized my father's hand, saying, "This must not be: you will give up *your* article; I shall give up *mine*, and we will remain friends."

After the commencement of the Revolution,

'the moderate party in the Assembly eagerly availed themselves of the influence of a publication conducted by a man of talent and independence, and of which the circulation was more extensive than that of almost any other political work, upwards of 12,000 copies of the political part of the "*Mercure*," consisting of three and a half sheets, being sold weekly. The court and the ministers likewise caused frequent communications to be made to my father, through persons attached to them, with a view of correcting erroneous opinions and misstatements of facts, proceeding from the tribune, the clubs, or the press.

'Numberless letters were addressed to him from the provinces, either with a view to publication or from individuals menaced and oppressed by the popular party, who requested him to vindicate their conduct, and solicited his opinion as to the course they were to pursue. Among these were many nobles, who asked his advice as to the expediency of emigrating.

'Mounier, Malouet, Clermont-Tonnerre, the Minister Montmorin, and Vicq d'Azyr, the queen's physician, were some of the principal persons with whom my father was in habitual communication at Paris, and I had acquired enough of English sentiments and opinions to attend with great eagerness and interest to the animated discussions which took place at our house. After the removal of the Assembly to Paris, the deputies with whom he was acquainted often came late in the evening to talk over the day's debate; and, the apartment in which I slept having a door opening into the drawing-room, I was allowed, as a great favour, to keep it ajar, and used to sit up in bed till a very late hour, with my ears stretched to the utmost, catching what I could of the animated conversation in the drawing-room. I remember on one occasion Malouet coming in very much agitated: he had been assailed and insulted by the populace, in consequence of some opinion he had

expressed, and had exhibited a pair of pistols which he always carried in his waistcoat pockets.'

Mallet du Pan's identification with the moderate or 'Constitutional reform' party naturally brought upon him at a later period the furious enmity of the clubs and sections of Paris; and three decrees of arrest, one hundred and fifteen denunciations, four 'assauts civiques' in his own house, and finally the confiscation of his property in France, were enough to make an independent journalist regret even the ministerial tyranny of the eighteenth century. We have, however, in these quotations anticipated the course of our story.

At the age of twelve, in 1786, Mr. Mallet was sent by his father, who had once visited England and had a genuine admiration for the political institutions and public spirit of the country, to learn English at a tutor's at Walthamstow, in Essex. During the four years he spent there, he became in feeling and habits, what he was before very long to become in fact, an Englishman. In the late summer of 1789 he returned to Paris, when he soon went to see the ruins of the Bastille.

'I also well remember October 5, and the scenes that ensued: the crowds of people returning from Versailles in a state of frightful excitement; the Poissards parading the streets in their red cottons and white caps, with large nosegays in their breasts, asking money at all the respectable houses with an air and tone that would have made it very unsafe to hesitate in complying with their demands.'

In March 1792 Mallet du Pan was selected by Louis XVI. for a secret mission to the Allied Powers at Frankfort, the well-known mission which preceded the issue of the Brunswick Manifesto. Frequent and violent denunciations in the Jacobin Club and other popular assemblies had for a long time threatened to put an end to his life and labours. One such scene is described by his daughter Amélie.

'A l'opéra où j'entendis vociférer ce bon peuple contre les aristocrates, et crier *Mallet du Pan à la lanterne!* Un signe de ma courageuse mère nous contint, mais je perdis subitement la mémoire, et le sentiment du lieu, et de ce qui se passait autour de moi, et il fallut bien me sortir de cette loge, effrayé qu'on était de mes questions à voix basse. Mlle. Morillon, notre amie, me fit prendre l'air et me soigna pendant que ma mère restait là immobile.'

He left Paris under a feigned name, and, in order to keep his mission as quiet as possible, it was thought advisable not to break up his establishment. Mme. Mallet du Pan

therefore 'remained at Paris for nearly four months, during 'a period of fearful excitement. She set out afterwards in 'the diligence, then the safest conveyance, with her three 'young children and one maid servant,' in August 1792, within one month of the massacres of September. 'Our 'furniture, plate, linen, and my father's valuable library and 'manuscripts were left to the care of a friend, but the whole 'was afterwards seized and lost to us.' The journey from Paris is thus described by the same daughter Amélie, afterwards Mme. Colladon :—

'Enfin, on quitta cette horrible France, et lorsqu'arrêtés dans la diligence à la sortie de Paris pour crier *vive la Nation!* ma mère s'empressait de le faire, aussi qu'un Monsieur de Lasausseye, ministre protestant qui fit le voyage avec nous; il me fut impossible d'articuler un son—on m'aurait plutôt haché. Comme j'étais à la portière de la voiture, cela fut remarqué; et le danger passé, le bon Lasausseye me gourmanda (scolded) vivement. J'avais 14 ans; j'en ai 55, et suis la même; mes opinions ont été fixées pour la vie. Si j'aime peu le peuple, j'ai certes mes raisons.'

Mallet du Pan passed through Geneva in March, when he was received by the most distinguished of his countrymen in a manner the most flattering to his feelings. His son had, in the spring of 1790, already been established in the counting-house of an uncle at Geneva, but his commercial education, partly on account of the violent temper of his uncle, who went by the name of 'Mallet l'Allumette,' did not prove to be an agreeable experience. His social relations were much pleasanter, but we cannot linger over the account of his boyish friendships and amusements, the Sunday 'sociétés,' the 'goûters de Prix,' the walking expeditions in the mountains of Savoy, and the games of prisoner's base with English fellow students, the description of whom applies with equal truth to their descendants. 'They were 'remarkable,' he says, 'for the great neatness of their attire, 'and no less so for their boisterous independence and unruly 'habits.'

Stern scenes demand our attention, and real historical interest attaches to the account of the Reign of Terror at Geneva—a 'dark interval in the history of the Republic, 'which all good citizens wish could be blotted out; but it is 'like the spot on Lady Macbeth's hand.'

Until 1782 the influence of the French Government in Geneva had been exercised with great forbearance, in the spirit of Cardinal Fleury's remark, 'Remember that the 'People are never in the wrong,' which formed part of his

instructions to Count de Lautrec on a mission to Geneva in 1737. For twenty years before the French Revolution Geneva had been the scene of the strife of classes, of civil broils and perpetual contests between the magistrates and the people, which culminated in the armed interference of the neighbouring States invoked by the aristocratic party. But in 1789 a compromise, which was the occasion of the most enthusiastic demonstrations of joy by all classes, was arrived at, and the public tranquillity seemed assured. The magistrates went and feasted in the popular clubs, and all was harmony and satisfaction. But the French Revolution had begun, many elements of discontent still existed; and during the next two or three years the democratic party intrigued with Clavière and other Genevese in Paris, and, in spite of a modification of the constitution carried out by the magistrates, they soon acquired sufficient influence to avow their projects and carry them into execution.

The 10th of August and the massacre of the Swiss Guards produced general consternation in the Swiss cantons, and in the month of September the French army under Montesquieu, who was instructed to show no mercy to Geneva, entered Savoy, and, in defiance of all treaties, advanced to within gunshot of the gates. The magistrates called upon Berne and Zurich for the assistance to which they were entitled by treaty, and placed the town in a state of defence.

‘The whole available population was armed: those that were already embodied in the town militia wore their uniforms; those that were not, wore their military accoutrements over their plain clothes. A grand guard was mounted every day, the gates and outposts relieved, and all the people who were not on duty and could be spared from their trades and domestic occupations were employed in working on the ramparts. Such a scene had not occurred since the massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1567, on which occasion the town had been placed in a state of siege, and even the maid-servants worked on the ramparts in the intervals of domestic labour! It was in the midst of these active preparations that the Swiss confederates arrived. The French village of Versoix, situated on the Swiss side of the lake, within five miles of Geneva, interrupted the direct communication with Switzerland. Our allies, therefore, embarked at Nyon, in the Pays de Vaud. They were met by the fleet of the Republic, consisting of several large barges, armed with *caronades*, with flags flying and bands playing; and on their landing at the *Molard* (the port of Geneva), the air resounded with acclamations; the inhabitants, crowding to the shore, welcomed and embraced the Confederate troops, and conducted them arm in arm to their quarters, singing patriotic songs all the way. I remember seeing many individuals of both sexes affected to tears. The old Swiss spirit seemed to have revived, and to defy all aggression;

and although more attentive observers might have discerned symptoms of weakness and irresolution in the Confederate Councils, the intoxicating nature of patriotic and warlike feelings left no room for reflection, and every heart glowed with the spirit of a "John de Bubenbergh" or an "Arnold de Winkelried."

But Montesquiou was a 'gentleman and a man of letters;' his sympathies were on the side of the little State, and in September 1792 he concluded a treaty which recognised the neutrality of Switzerland, and, while it enraged the Jacobins, gave a breathing space to the Republic. Montesquiou soon afterwards 'sought a refuge from these implacable men 'among the happy people from whose country he had 'warded off the scourge of war.'

In the course of the next year, 1793, great changes took place both in the Government and the Executive Councils; the democratic party grew daily stronger, a legislative assembly was formed 'with a gallery for the sovereign 'people.' The French Resident Servan introduced a body of French troops into the city and became a sort of proconsul, and his successor Soulaire gave an even more active impulse to revolutionary opinions—'Soulaire, who had been an *abbé*, 'and had risen in the Revolution by those means which a 'late historian (Mignet) seems disposed to recommend—"by 'serving the people according to their notions, and not 'according to our own:" a most happy discovery in the 'science of political morality, by means of which one may 'safely disregard all obligations of conscience, and assume 'the merit of superior virtue, when only pursuing a career 'of personal ambition!'

'Early on the morning of July 6, 1794, a servant entered my room with the intelligence that several hundred persons, including most of the old magistrates and nearly all the friends of my family, had been arrested in the night; that the search continued, and that my uncle had left home and was concealed in an attic of the Maison Tremblez, a house opposite to ours. The terror and consternation that ensued can hardly be described, for there was scarcely a family in the higher classes who had not relations and friends under the knife; and some idea may be formed of these distressing anxieties from the number of persons arrested, which exceeded 600 in a town of 20,000 inhabitants. My first feeling on the breaking out of this revolutionary frenzy was one of deep gratitude to God for my father's absence; but it was yet possible, if I was discovered to be his son, that some threats might be held out to him, which, knowing as I did his warm affection and fearless character, might be attended with disastrous consequences.'

The boy therefore determined to keep out of the way as much as possible, and arranged a hiding-place for himself,

in case of further domiciliary visits, in the cupboard of a neighbour's apartments.

'I was one day sitting in my room, when I heard a noise of steps and strange voices on the little wooden gallery and staircase that led to it, and the moment afterwards four armed men, of the most ferocious aspect, entered, and desired me in a brusque and authoritative manner to give an account of myself. The disagreeable impression made upon European travellers by the lower classes of Yankees has often reminded me of the pert inquisitiveness and drawling tones of my own countrymen; peculiarities which did not add any grace to the manner of these ruffians. They asked me who I was. I answered that I was a clerk in M. Mallet's counting-house, and that my parents lived in Switzerland. Who knew me, and could answer for me? I mentioned M. Bridel, a Pays de Vaud merchant settled at Geneva, who had married a relation of my mother's, and had gone great lengths in revolutionary opinions, though far short of the men then in power. This reference satisfied them, and, after having made a note of it, they left me.'

Lists of proscription were handed about, and numerous individuals were mentioned as likely to suffer; but no one thought it really possible. But on the 14th of July at daybreak

'I heard the *Générale* beating through the town, and the hurried steps of the citizens proceeding to the Bastion, a public walk of some extent, forming a part of the fortifications, and planted with groves of trees. Three thousand men assembled, and remained all day under arms, whilst the Revolutionary Tribunal was proceeding with the trials. Oh, what a day, and what a night! Even at this moment, and at the distance of more than thirty years, and far removed from the scene of this disastrous event, I cannot bring back the circumstances to my mind without being overcome by the recollection. I had studiously concealed from my grandmother and the other ladies of the house what was going on, and we retired as usual at an early hour of the night to our several apartments. I knew not what might be the next event, and was pacing up and down my room in a state of indescribable agitation, when I heard a distant volley. I leant an anxious ear for a second report, thinking it might be a contest between the revolutionary party and the citizens; but a dead silence ensued. Then again the streets became crowded with people proceeding with hurried steps; and then again all was hushed for the night! The truth then flashed across my mind, and my first impulse was to run to the Bastion; but a little reflection and a burst of tears brought me to a sense of my helplessness. If I had followed my first impulse I should have found no impediment, no tumult, no guards to bar the way—but a dead silence, and a complete solitude. "Every face had gathered paleness, and every heart was humbled; and countenances were fallen and sunk, as of those who waited every moment to be summoned to the bar and numbered in the grave."

The sentence of death had just been carried out against some of the most respectable citizens; the first shedding of blood would doubtless have been followed by a wider proscription, but the reign of terror in France was on the wane, the Committee of Public Safety was divided, and in a fortnight more Robespierre and his colleagues had fallen. These circumstances induced the Revolutionary Committee of Geneva to pause in their bloody career, and to substitute banishment and penalties for military executions.

Four lists were made out: the first, who were all absent, were condemned to death; the second banished for life or various periods; the third fined and imprisoned; the fourth only fined.

‘These pains and penalties were embodied in a proclamation which was read in various parts of the town by a public officer, preceded by trumpets and a detachment of troops; and one of the stations for this purpose being under our windows, I heard my father’s name proclaimed one of the first as condemned to suffer death if ever found on the territory of the Republic. Thank God, he was beyond their reach, but my heart nevertheless sank within me. My uncle was included in the third list—fined, and ordered to keep his house for three months; the latter a severe task for one who rushed to prison rather than bear the confinement of a hiding-place.’

Such was the course of events in Geneva, a good example of the effects of the revolutionary frenzy which swept Europe from end to end. The Jacobin conquest was a ‘brigandage, ‘*mais philosophique*;’ the methods of their propaganda, the weapons of their tyranny, were everywhere the same, and no less universal was the disgraceful and ruinous apathy of private citizens in presence of the ascendancy of a small minority. The importance of Mallet du Pan among the *témoins* of the French Revolution lies in his having analysed and understood the spirit of Jacobinism like a physiologist, to use M. Taine’s comparison, who spends ten years in studying some new or little understood disease. Mallet spent ten years ‘à faire la monographie de la fièvre révolutionnaire.’ His work is of abiding value, for revolution is in all ages the same.

It had been impossible for Mallet du Pan to remain at Geneva a single day after the departure of the Swiss troops. He went at first to Lausanne, and stayed with his friend Baron d’Erlach de Spietz, *bailli* of Lausanne, when, as his son says, he and his family enjoyed a high degree of consideration, many persons of consequence, native and foreign, seeking his correspondence, and copies of his letters being

sent all over the country. He then moved to, and settled at, Berne, where he was at the time of the bloody revolution at Geneva and the subsequent annexation of that country to France in 1794, and where his son before long rejoined him with feelings of deep and grateful emotion.

Family life, pleasant society, simple manners, above all absorbing political interest, and the sense of being in the centre of intrigue, combined to make this period an agreeable one. Accordingly Mr. Mallet's picture of it is full of interest. The family lived first in the town and later in a small country house near the little Belp, a couple of miles to the south of Berne, with a good walled garden and terrace looking towards Berne and the Aar, and a farm belonging to the proprietor attached.

'I was perfectly charmed with the environs of Berne, and explored them in every direction. I would often leave home after breakfast, with a book in my pocket, and trace the windings of a stream or mountain glen, or following any chance path in one of those dark and extensive woods which abound in the neighbourhood; thus rambling for hours in wild and unfrequented places, till

"I knew each lane, and every alley green,
Dingle, and bushy dell of those wild woods,
And every bosky bourn from side to side."

I often lost my way, or found it obstructed by the river Arne rolling on in some deep recess of the woods; at other times I came out unexpectedly upon one of those green, sequestered spots, with a farmhouse and fountain, delineated by Aberli; or upon some headland, commanding an extensive view of the Alps and surrounding scene. No one who has not lived in a mountainous country, and rambled without restraint and without object in its wild recesses, can fully enter into the delight of such excursions.'

Their society was principally composed of French and Genevese refugees, among whom the virtuous and distinguished President of the National Assembly, Mounier, and his family, stood foremost in their regard. Among the Genevese was a great friend of Mallet du Pan, Count Gallatin, 'a superior man in spite of his affected manners,' who died Minister of Bavaria at Paris. There were also a Genevese Councillor of State, M. Falquet, and his wife, the Diodatis, and some others. The little circle of refugees met several times a week.

'Our walks home at night from the country houses of our friends, muffled up in our cloaks, and with servants carrying lanterns, were often full of merriment. The interests, opinions, and prejudices of our little circle were all engaged on the same side; we only differed as to the means

of bringing about a counter-Revolution ; and my father's judgment in these matters being held paramount, whenever he condescended to join our parties it was considered as a great compliment.

' But we did not allow politics to engross all our thoughts. Madame Falquet, Count Gallatin, and Smidtmeier were among the most agreeable persons of Geneva ; nor had we any deficiency of grace, youth, and beauty. Cécile Cramer, Madame de Launay, and my sister Amélie (although very young) were all attractive persons. Madame de Launay at first carried away all hearts. I humbly followed in the train, and for the first and last time in my life was admitted to the toilette of a pretty Frenchwoman. But Madame de Launay had a husband ; a sensible, gentlemanlike man, who took our attentions in very good part, but was nevertheless her husband. Then Madame de Launay rouged, and she looked one day very much like another ; she did not, therefore, long retain her captives, and Cécile Cramer and my sister, whose conversation was more animated and agreeable, carried the day. Robin and a young de Saucy devoted themselves to my sister. Cécile Cramer very soon drew me into her toils.'

' I believe,' he concludes, ' I have said enough to satisfy ' any reasonable person that a young man of twenty-one could ' not employ his time to less advantage than I did at Berne.' But he devoted some time to learning Italian, and was also generally employed an hour or two each day in copying for his father, who, a sort of minister *in partibus*, as he has been described, of the threatened monarchies, had a regular weekly despatch of news and counsel for the courts of Vienna, Berlin, and Lisbon. It is this correspondence which, under the auspices of M. Taine, was published a few years ago and formed the subject of an article in this Journal. The correspondence was paid for, and formed at this period the sole dependence of the family ; but, as the son says, it is distinguished throughout by that fearlessness of opinion and manly tone which characterise his public writings.

Besides this there was an active correspondence with Malouet, Montlosier, Count François de St. Aldegonde, the Abbé Pradt, Lord Elgin (British Minister at Berlin), Mr. Trevor (British Minister at Turin), Sir John Macpherson, and Mounier and Gallatin, after they had left Berne. Mallet du Pan's time was further occupied by interviews with political characters and others who came to Berne to communicate their schemes, to ask his advice, to request his assistance with the allied Powers, or merely to talk politics and make his acquaintance.

' I have a note,' says Mr. Mallet, ' of Madame de Stael's written to my father from the "Faucon" (an inn at Berne) in terms highly complimentary, requesting an interview with him. He, however,

declined seeing her, which was somewhat stern, and can only be explained by his dread of her intriguing disposition, and his extreme aversion to political notoriety in women. An exception, however, might have been in favour of Madame de Stael.*

On his return one day from a walking tour with a friend through the Bernese Highlands, he was received with the news that, through the influence of Mr. Trevor, he had been offered the post of private secretary to Sir Richard Worsley, then British Minister at Venice. 'No circumstance in the 'whole of my life,' he says, 'elated me so much as this.' The account of the journey by the St. Gothard, the lakes, Milan, Verona, Vicenza, Padua, and the Brenta; the description of Venice in the last days of her independence; the palazzo of the Ambassador, with the pictures and statues collected by him, his villa at Colle Aprico, 'the easy regular' country life there, the gastronomic part of the establishment being perfect, the vintage; above all, the characters of Sir Richard and Lady Worsley—the latter a person of somewhat doubtful character and antecedents,—all this forms, perhaps, the most entertaining part of the volume. It may easily be conceived that a youth brought up as he had been did not easily adapt himself to the habits and conversation of a household such as he describes. His *naïvetés* amused and perhaps finally annoyed the Ambassador, and a fever which he soon contracted gave an excuse for bringing his employment to a close. Sir Richard wrote to Mr. Trevor that neither young Mallet's *morale* nor his *physique* was suited to the atmosphere of Venice, in which he was probably not altogether mistaken.

He did not long remain at Berne, where his affectionate welcome by his father failed to console him in his disappointment. An opportunity offered of an expedition to England, where, through his father's friends, he had hopes of obtaining employment; and his sister Amélie, who wished to revisit some friends in Paris, decided to accompany him so far. In October 1796, when the brother and sister arrived in France, that country was just awakening from the greatest political

* We may quote Mr. Mallet's note at this place: 'I do not mean to quote Jeremy Bentham in matters either of common sense or of good breeding; but it seems, by the memoirs of him lately published by Dr. Bowering, that he likewise declined meeting Madame de Stael when she was in England, and withstood her desire to be introduced to him. He called her in his own strange vocabulary "a trumpery mag pie." A rude and unwarrantable epithet!'

convulsion of modern times ; but there is little that is new in the few political observations they made—nothing, at all events, which is not familiar to students of Mallet du Pan's description of the degradation alike of rulers and ruled.

Minute touches, however, such as the following passage gives us, are of some interest :—

‘The tide of social life runs so strong in great capitals that the deepest impressions of the time are soon effaced by the next wave. The effects of the Reign of Terror were therefore much more apparent in the provinces than at Paris. I remember our stopping for the night on the Geneva side of Auxerre at an inn which exhibited some singular contrasts. The walls of the rooms were only whitewashed, and the floors filthy, the linen unusually coarse, and the common *apparat* of a French *auberge* peculiarly uncomfortable ; and yet the table on which we dined and the chairs of our apartments were carved and gilt, and the latter were covered with the richest worked crimson damask. The curtains of one of our beds were also of some rich silk, whilst those of another bed in the same room were made of coarse printed calico. A beautiful clock stood on a common stone chimney-piece ; and the fire requiring a little assistance, the mistress of the inn took from the side of the chimney a pair of elegant bellows that had belonged to the same drawing-room as the chairs. On our making some observation on those handsome articles of furniture, the woman blushed and seemed displeased, and the people of the house all had a sulky and forbidding look, which made us suspect that they had not come honestly by their bargains.’

The traveller did not fail to notice the improvement in the position of the agricultural classes—the one definite, immediate, and lasting advantage brought about by the French Revolution. Arrived at Paris they ‘felt, however absurd it may seem, a sort of surprise at seeing the same things in ‘the same places.’ . . . ‘We almost expected to have found ‘the pavements indelibly stained with blood.’

We may find room for the following reflection :—

‘It is impossible to look back upon that period of the French Revolution without amazement that such a tragedy should have gone on so long among a people who were but a few years before the most civilised in the world ; and yet it might have lasted much longer had France been under the rule of an aristocratic instead of a democratic faction. Sylla, supported by his order and great family, lived in perfect security at Rome, after having exercised the most bloody tyranny for many years, but democratic factions are of a fluctuating and unstable nature ; they seldom outlive their excesses, and their leaders generally perish in the conflict.’

On his arrival in England the young man was received with open arms by a large circle of French emigrants,

belonging principally to the group of Constitutional Royalists, the most distinguished among whom were Malouet, Lally Tollendal, and Montlosier. They treated him 'almost as a son,' and a day never passed without his seeing them. Malouet formed a high opinion of young Mallet. 'If we return to France,' he said, in a letter to his father, 'we must get him employed at the Foreign Office. His discretion, his judgment, and his knowledge will soon bring him distinction.'

At Malouet's house and at the Princesse d'Hénin he used to meet the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the Chevalier de Panate, the Prince de Poix, the Comte de Duras, and his correspondence with his father often turned upon the

'erroneous views of his friends, their exaggerated expectations of Bonaparte, their exultation in his military deeds, and the bias their opinions received from the longing they all felt for their native country. The Princesse d'Hénin was peculiarly tenacious and irritable, and used sometimes to send for me to give me a lecture on my father's opinions. My patience was often put to a severe test, and Malouet and Lally were obliged to interfere on one occasion.'

But, as he says, he had not come to England to break lances with a French princess, and all this time he was engaged in the 'sickening task of soliciting the assistance of patrons.' He had some English friends, among them Miss Berry and Lady Herries. Sir John Macpherson was full of plans for him, which came to nothing; and another friend, Mr. John Reeves, whose appointment as chief justice of Newfoundland while he was resident in London gave rise to the observation 'either that justice was not necessary to Newfoundland, or that John Reeves was not necessary to justice,' treated him with the greatest kindness. Lord Dunmore, however, was the only one who approached Lord Grenville, from whom he received the answer that no foreigner could be employed in a public department. The most interesting figure which appears in these pages is that of Warren Hastings. The proceedings against this celebrated man had excited great interest in France, and Mallet du Pan, always roused by an appearance of oppression, had opened the pages of the '*Mercur*' to a fairer statement of his case than could be gathered from the speeches of the managers of the impeachment. Young Mallet, during his previous visit, had twice been to the House of Lords during the trial,

'and the person of Mr. Hastings, his white hair, the fine character of his head, and the situation in which he stood at the bar, had strongly ex-

cited my sympathy. Mr. Burke's impassioned and almost vindictive manner and looks, whilst speaking in the manager's box (of which I have a distinct recollection, as well as of the great man himself, dressed in a snuff-coloured suit, with bag and sword), had likewise contributed to give me an unfavourable impression of a cause in which so much party spirit seemed to be engaged.'

Hastings now called upon him ('*ce que n'a fait aucune autre personne*'), invited him to his house, and

'entered at length and with great indulgence into the objects of my journey to this country. He warned me not to be too sanguine, for the difficulties of procuring a situation for a foreigner were considerable; and added, that his desire of avoiding all appearance of private solicitation in his own cause had prevented him on his return from India from cultivating the society of persons of rank and influence, to whom he had but little access; but that he retained a strong sense of his obligations to my father, and would do for me whatever lay in his power. As he was going out of town for some weeks, he desired me to write to him if I thought he could be of any service, offered me his purse and his house, and left me strongly impressed with the kindness of my reception.'

But nothing came of the kindness of his friends, and he was obliged to console himself with the reflection that other advantages had attended his visit to London.

'I was breaking ground, disengaging myself from exclusive opinions, and enlarging my sphere of observation. My father was so little communicative to his family that I had acquired much less in his conversation than I might have done under other circumstances. I now lived with men of superior understanding, great information and knowledge of mankind, of enlarged and liberal views, who took the kindest interest in my improvement. I had not, like my father, the advantages of a good education and of a capacious mind, and the hold that politics* had taken of me, and politics, too, of a narrow cast, was therefore a real misfortune. But my views became greatly modified in the society of Malouet and his friends; I acquired juster notions, and learnt to distinguish between revolutions and improvements in government. I laid aside many idols, never again to restore them to their shrines.'

The boy, in fact, had become a man, and we begin to see indications of the liberal and tolerant spirit which led him,

* The following note enables one to realise better than much historical reading, how great is the tension of mind under which men live in times of political convulsion: 'Johnson once asked, Who sleeps the worse for one general's ill-success and another's capitulation? I might answer that many have been my sleepless nights from lost battles and political anxieties. I remember on the news reaching London, in March 1797, of the defeat of the Archduke Charles by Bonaparte on the Tagliamento, my retiring to my bedroom and weeping bitterly.'

in spite of the training of his early political experience, to ally himself in sympathy with liberal opinion in English life, though he never lost his philosophical moderation of tone. What could be better put in this sense than the following passage:—

‘It is of great importance to happiness not to lag too much behind our age; to have an indulgent feeling for the prevailing opinions of our time; and not to attach ourselves with a fond and pertinacious partiality to forms of government and social institutions which are fast declining in public esteem. I feel great attachment and respect for this country of England as at present constituted, and I should be very sorry to see any great change in my own time; but I nevertheless endeavour to wean myself from it, for when the schoolmaster is abroad we can neither direct nor restrain his career. All that is in our power is to be found at all times by the side of moderate and virtuous men; as Burke says in his letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol: “I am aware that the age is not what we all wish; but I am sure that the only means to check its degeneracy is heartily to concur with whatever is best in our time.”’

It was perhaps natural that there should now become discernible a certain attitude of criticism towards his father’s political opinions, an attitude which did not amount to a difference of principle, but which gives the impression of want of complete appreciation and sympathy. As he himself says:—

‘My father lived in times of revolution and extreme opinions; and although he kept clear of the ultras of all parties, the dreadful scenes which he witnessed, and the personal sufferings to which he was subjected, more or less influenced the tone of his writings. His political opinions were always honest and always consistent, and uniformly favourable to constitutional freedom; and when the tempest had abated, and he thought he saw the dawn of better days, he supported moderate counsels, and encouraged the exertions of moderate men; but when he quitted France, in 1792, he considered and recommended war,* and an armed interference on the part of the foreign Powers, as the only means of checking the excesses of the Revolution, and of saving the Royal Family. Events have proved the fallacy of these expectations, and the danger with which this policy was fraught. On other and later occasions, also, my father’s opinions appear to me to have been under the influence of exciting circumstances; and I could not, therefore, in giving an account of his writings, altogether avoid critical remarks.’

* It is to be remembered, however, that before war broke out no one felt more strongly the necessity of peace. ‘War,’ he said, ‘would only strengthen the Revolution and render it more atrocious.’ Mallet du Pan’s attitude on this important question is fully discussed in the second of the two articles above alluded to.

The lot of the son was cast for the greater part of his life in times of peace and liberal progress. His temperament was critical and judicial, and it was not unnatural that he should, in looking back, see in the 'courant intarissable de 'logique et de passion' which characterises the writings of the French Burke, some exaggerations which obscured for him their real merit. It would be easy to show that Mallet du Pan's estimate was based upon a deeper insight and a truer appreciation of the great events in which he was an actor; and historical criticism has now done full justice to his political position. We can only here note that his unique character as an observer of the Revolution arises from the fact that by principle, reflection, and disposition he was a Liberal. Not, indeed, in the sense in which, as Mr. Hutton has told us, the term 'liberalism' is oftener used than in any other, namely, to signify the disposition to make concession to popular demands, but in the sense of M. Taine's fine definition. 'Liberalism,' says the historian, 'means respect for others. Each person should be 'respected by the State and by his neighbours; the individual, like the community, should have its own domain, bounded, assured, fixed, by law and custom. Whoever 'penetrates into the inviolable precinct which encloses his 'person, his property, his conscience, his beliefs, his opinions, 'his home, his private life, and his domestic duties, is an 'intruder; if the State exists it is to prevent intrusion; if it 'itself intrudes it becomes the worst of offenders.' Inspired by this faith Mallet du Pan, a Protestant, defended the Roman Catholic religion; a republican, he championed the monarchy; he sacrificed, in Paris, all but his life; and, with Switzerland, his native land, it was in this spirit that he rejoiced to find in England a refuge which delivered him at least from the 'tourment du silence,' 'un port où je puis 'accuser sans les craindre des tyrans en démence!' This was the temper he brought to the great work of his life; the ten years' analysis of the revolutionary fever, the dissection of the spirit of Jacobinism, which to this day retains all its truth, its far-seeing sagacity, its moral significance.

In June 1797, the object of his voyage to England having totally failed, his father recalled him, meaning to associate him with himself in a project of establishing a periodical work in France on the model of the 'Mercure;' for the weakness of the revolutionary government and the progress made by Royalist opinions seemed to indicate that the time for such an enterprise had come. He passed through Paris, and there

heard rumours of the *coup d'état* which the Directory were meditating. A week after he had left Paris the blow fell, and the events of the 18 Fructidor postponed the hopes of the Royalists for a generation.

On his arrival at Berne he found a very disquieting state of affairs. He had already heard at Paris confirmation of the intimation given by Bonaparte to Haller, that his countrymen would have cause to regret the countenance and protection which his father had received at Berne. Before long the question whether Mallet du Pan should be desired to quit Berne (in which as a 'combourgeois' he had a right of residence) was raised by the French party in the Council of Berne, and after two unsuccessful attempts a motion to that effect was carried. So unpopular was this decision in Berne, where Mallet du Pan was much respected, that he was given to understand that it would not be followed up. But it was clearly not safe to stay, and he was the last man in the world to solicit a favour. Passing through Zurich and Constance, he finally decided to pass the winter in Freiburg in the Breisgau, where he was courteously received by the Austrian governor, Baron de Sumarau. From this place he watched with anxious anticipation the unprovoked and unjustifiable aggression of the French on the liberties of his native country.

'Every day's post brought us some distressing intelligence, some deep and heartrending tale of woe and destruction. All that we held dear was involved in the greatest of political calamities—foreign invasion embittered by civil war. Madame de Bonstetten, who was at Interlachen to the last, wrote to me regularly. She was surrounded by manifestations of loyalty and public spirit, the Oberland being all in arms; but her eye was fixed on the Councils of the Republic, where she saw nothing but irresolute and wavering opinions. As the French advanced a number of Swiss families fled to Friburg, where they all came to lament with my father the calamities of which their treatment of him had been the first signal.

The winter which they passed here was not, however, without the satisfaction afforded by the presence of some pleasant friends. Portalis and his son were frequent visitors. The Abbé Georgel is also mentioned, and

'The Abbé de Lisle was our daily guest, and his natural vivacity and agreeable conversation made us forget everything else for the time. He was an *Abbé de Salon*, who had lived in the best society of Paris, and possessed an inexhaustible fund of anecdote, which he told in a graceful and lively manner. He was likewise always ready to recite passages from his works, a task which he performed with great spirit and feeling. But notwithstanding his genius and social accomplish-

ments, the Abbé de Lisle was the merest child that ever lived; amused with any bauble; on some subjects quite inaccessible to reason; a creature of caprice and passion. On hearing him describe the "green and white" pasteboard cabriolet with which he dashed along the boulevards at Paris, one might have taken him for an Eton boy let loose from school; and, when he raved about the Revolution, for an *Echappé* from Bicêtre. All that he saw in that great event was the loss of his abbey: men, measures, opinions, times, were all confounded in his mind in one indistinguishable mass, through which he could discern nothing but his lost abbey.'

But it soon became necessary to decide on some permanent abode and means of livelihood. The Duke of Brunswick had pressed him to join his friend Mounier at Wolfenbüttel, and Vienna had also been suggested to him as a residence.

'My father's health was impaired, and he had been subject throughout the winter to a very painful cough. He had also deeply felt the treatment he had met with at Berne and the public calamities that followed. Whatever scheme we might form was subject to serious contingencies, and the retiring to England, which in some respects seemed the least unpromising, would be attended with heavy expense. This project had been first suggested to us by a Scotch gentleman at Berne, Mr. Mackintosh, a sensible, well-informed man, who recommended my father to consult his friends in this country as to the probable success of a French periodical work to be published in London in the manner of the "*Mercure de France*."

Mr. Wickham was favourable to the scheme; Mr. John Reeves took it up very warmly, and reported that Lord Liverpool and Mr. Windham desired him to encourage Mallet du Pan in his plans. He therefore decided to go to London, purchased a carriage for the journey, and travelled slowly across Germany to Cuxhaven, where they embarked. After a stormy passage of eighty-two hours ('during which 'I had not a single interval of ease'), diversified by an alarm of pursuit by a French privateer, they landed at Yarmouth on May 1, 1798, and soon made the best of their way to Mr. Reeves's hospitable house in Cecil Street, in the Strand.

In a letter to Count Gallatin, dated 18th May, 1798, Mallet du Pan drew a picture of the headlong and somewhat fanatical spirit of this country, which was not only perfectly true of that particular crisis, but is, says his son, equally applicable to all circumstances of strong excitement in England.

'Je me crois dans un autre monde et un autre siècle; la transition du Continent à l'Angleterre frappe d'étonnement. C'est bien aujourd'hui qu'il faut dire "et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos." J'ai

laissé de l'autre côté de la mer le Continent se débattant dans les convulsions d'une paix honteuse, qu'il tâche d'obtenir ou de conserver à tout prix. Je l'ai laissé ne sachant que résoudre, perdu d'angoisse, de divisions, de terreurs ; n'osant ni se défendre, ni s'unir ; dépourvu de tout patriotisme, et ne pouvant combiner deux moyens de salut. Ici, on est en pleine guerre ; écrasé de taxes, en lutte aux fureurs de l'ennemi le plus acharné ; et cependant la sécurité, l'abondance, l'énergie règnent partout ; dans la chaumière, comme dans le palais. Je n'ai pas aperçu un symptôme d'inquiétude timide. Le spectacle de l'esprit public a de beaucoup passé mon attente. La nation n'avait pas encore appris à connaître sa puissance et ses ressources. Le Gouvernement lui en a donné le secret, et lui a inspiré une confiance sans bornes. Ces dispositions vont jusqu'à l'exaltation. Je trouve ici beaucoup de fanatisme, mais exclusivement dans la partie la plus saine de la nation. Elle abhorre la France, la Révolution, les Jacobins, le Directoire, comme la France haïssait les Aristocrates en 1789.'

But in England, as Voltaire observed, there is never any popular comprehension of a question of foreign policy, and the immigrants soon discovered that the 'fond de la question' was not better understood here than elsewhere. Neither statesmen nor people could appreciate the wisdom of the scheme of policy which Mallet du Pan never ceased to press upon the allies. 'Union, perseverance, irreconcilable hostility to those men and those principles which were the off-spring of the French Revolution, and which threatened the destruction of the old Governments and the old institutions of every European commonwealth,' were the text of all his writings and all his exhortations. The following passage admirably describes his policy, and points out some of the reasons of its failure :

'What my father had constantly in his mind, and what he anxiously laboured to bring about from the time that he left France to the day of his death, was such a combination of public spirit and well-directed efforts among the Continental States whose independence was threatened by the French as we subsequently witnessed in 1813, after the Russian campaign. But the progress of events could not be anticipated ; nor were there, perhaps, originally motives of sufficient weight in the circumstances and principle of the French War to rouse Continental nations to such efforts. Since the religious contests of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there had not been any national wars in Europe—the people felt no interest in the result of such wars as the War of Succession and the Seven Years' War. But the French Revolution was an era in human affairs. It appealed to our passions, engaged all generous impulses on its side, opened prospects of improvements and happiness never before contemplated. It professed the realisation of the most sanguine speculations of political philosophy. It called patriots and ambitious men and men of talents to its standard, and offered them the spoils of the privileged classes in every country.

Nor are we to overlook, in the consideration of this mighty event, that the powerful spirits that gave it its first impulse did not claim the sympathy of mankind on national grounds alone, but went back to original principles, and appealed to every man's breast, of whatever kindred, in support of their claim to an equality of civil and political rights. Such an appeal, if asserted with magnanimity, moderation, and virtue by a great and warlike people, would have overcome every obstacle; but the horrors of the Revolution, the factious and sanguinary character of many of its leaders, the cruelties and exactions of war, gave a new character to the contest, brought forth new motives of resistance, afforded rallying points to the old opinions, and ultimately led to the result we have witnessed. Between the years 1793 and 1800 the dread of revolutionary terrors and of the French armies checked every idea of resistance: there had not yet been enough of political encroachments and of military oppression; national feelings had not yet been so wounded and trampled upon as to induce men to run all risks rather than bear any longer so intolerable a rule. My father's hopes were, therefore, fallacious, and the more so as he had the meanest opinion of the privileged classes in the old States of the Continent. The whole tenor of his writings tends to show that his hopes were exclusively *in the people*. And yet the people were then everywhere passive save in England; and if they were not passive in England, it was because they had institutions and a form of government which were respected and valued, and men of energy and talent to guide them.'

It was with the object of furthering this policy of effectual resistance to the Revolution that Mallet du Pan desired to establish a political journal in England, and he naturally sought for some support from the Government.

'There was then,' writes his son, 'hardly a court in Europe, save that of London, where a public writer of such character and influence would not have met with some personal attentions from the individuals at the head of the Government. My father had been entrusted with an important mission by Louis XVI.; he had been marked out by Bonaparte and the Directory as a man to be hunted out of the Continent; he had lost his fortune, health, and peace of mind; he had been banished from France for supporting an oppressed minority, with whom he had no other community of interest and feeling than a sense of public wrong; he was a Republican and a Protestant—they were the privileged members of a Catholic and absolute monarchy. He might therefore have expected, without any unreasonable pretensions, that the same men who were lavishing the treasures and the blood of this country in resisting the progress of the Revolution by every possible means, legitimate and illegitimate, would not have left him wholly unnoticed; more particularly as there was hardly a subordinate agent employed in conducting some of the disgraceful underplot, then going on, that had not a personal access to the ministers. Mr. Pitt had, however, no predilection for men of letters, and was not conversant with French. Politics seem to have been his

sole care, and port wine and Henry Dundas his chief solace. But Lord Grenville and Lord Spencer, Lord Loughborough, Windham, and Canning were capable of appreciating the merits of a foreign writer. I have already mentioned Mr. Windham's courteous reception of us; but our intercourse ended there. We afterwards met Mr. Canning at Sir W. Drummond's, to whom Lord Dunmore had introduced us; but his manner was distant and cold, and he did not utter five sentences during the whole of dinner. Gifford, the poet, who was likewise there, maintained a repulsive silence; such are the manners of this country, and the reception foreigners not unfrequently experience even in the best society. I am aware that such disappointments were not peculiar to us, and that in a greater or less degree Johnson's maxim that "for aught he knew all foreigners were fools" generally prevails in the minds of Englishmen. I am likewise aware of the disinclination of English people, even the best bred and best educated, to converse in French; but this "*mauvaise honte*" ought to give way to a feeling of courtesy and to the desire of benefiting by the conversation of men distinguished for their information or talents.'

In spite of all difficulties, however, a fortnightly journal, entitled the '*Mercure Britannique*,' written in French, was started.

'All our friends exerted themselves with the greatest zeal, and subscriptions came in rapidly. The Dukes of York, Kent, and Gloucester, the ministers, and many persons of rank and of Parliamentary or literary distinction, were among the number. Most of the foreign ministers in England, and many distinguished persons on the Continent likewise subscribed, so that we soon exceeded 500 copies, and in the course of a few months reached 750: a large circulation considering the nature of a publication so little attractive to most English readers; for it is a remarkable circumstance that foreign newspapers or reviews are hardly ever met with in England, even in the houses of the greatest pretension to political and literary intelligence.'

The first number contained an account, written with remarkable power and eloquence, of the invasion of Switzerland and the destruction of the Helvetic Confederacy—an event which had excited great interest and indignation in England, and the work had an immediate and gratifying success.

'This auspicious beginning put us all in good spirits; we saw the hope of better days, and of a less precarious and restless existence; but popularity is seldom attained without some sacrifices. Our drawing-room became a sort of *levée*, which very much broke in upon my father's time and occupations. Our emigrant friends, who came in and out all day and at all hours, formed much the best part of our society, for most of them were distinguished men.* Besides those I

* Chateaubriand was then in England, and gave an evening lecture at M. Malouet's, at which he read '*Atala*' and some sketches of

have mentioned, we often saw Cicé, the old Archbishop of Bordeaux, who had been Keeper of the Seals in 1790; and his nephew, the Chevalier de la Bentinaye, an amiable, good-humoured, sensible man; the Archbishop of Aix, a courtly, eloquent, high-bred ecclesiastic of a noble family; the Prince de Poix, the Baron de Gilliers, the Abbé Lajare, Panat; Bourmont, the Vendéan chief, afterwards General of Division under Napoleon—a clever, graceful, insinuating person; Pozzo di Borgo, a Corsican by birth, who subsequently became a favourite of the Emperor Alexander, and one of the most active and influential agents in the great political events which began at Moscow and terminated at Waterloo. Pozzo di Borgo has now been Russian ambassador at Paris ever since 1814, and has probably had more to say in the affairs of that country and those of Europe during that period than any other individual save Talleyrand. A true Corsican, but possessing extraordinary sagacity and talents.'

We cannot follow Mr. Mallet in his account of the contents of the publication, beyond alluding to a discussion in a later number on the character of the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the French encyclopædists, and their influence as causes of the Revolution—a philosophical paper in which the conclusions of subsequent historical criticisms are anticipated in a most remarkable manner. A writer of opinions so definite and statesmanlike as Mallet du Pan and of such fearlessness in expressing them, could not, however, fail to arouse enmities, and become involved in controversies. At one time it was the ultra-royalist plotters and intriguers—'Marats à cocarde blanche'—who assailed him and Malouet with peculiar virulence as traitors and apostates because of their known preference for a liberal or constitutional monarchy; assailed them in spite of the open protection given them by Monsieur, who on more than one occasion expressed his concurrence in Mallet du Pan's views and the highest opinion of his judgement and sagacity. At another time he found himself in disagreement with those who, as Bonaparte's power grew, began to look to the hope of better days in France under a settled and powerful Government. Mallet du Pan was too faithful to liberal principles of government to take comfort in the establishment of a military despotism,

his subsequent work, '*Le Génie du Christianisme*.' Many persons of note among the emigrants were there, and Calonne and my father were of the number. After the lecture my father said to the persons near him, '*Il y a du talent dans tout cela, mais je ne comprends rien à ces harmonies de la Nature et de la Religion:*' in which opinion Calonne concurred. No man was less liable to be captivated by mere style than my father was, nor applied more habitually the test of common sense to writings and conversation.

which he had long foretold as the inevitable outcome of the Revolution—too clear-sighted to share the absurd illusion that Bonaparte was a General Monk who sought for power with a view to the restoration of the legitimate monarch.

‘He thoroughly distrusted Bonaparte, whose conduct towards Venice and the Swiss cantons had, in his opinion, put the seal to his character. He never underrated his talents, but held him to be utterly disregarding of truth and moral principle, full of pretence, *grand phrasier*, and of that class of statesmen who consider mankind as mere knaves and dupes, and incapable of being actuated by any but selfish motives. At the same time he did full justice to his great superiority over the men he had displaced, to his conciliating and firm system of government, and the hopes it held out. This was enough to expose my father to charges of inconsistency and altered opinions, and this from men who a few years afterwards were found among the most assiduous courtiers at the Tuileries.

The ‘*Mercury*’ continued to be successful, the net receipts for the first year having exceeded 1,000*l.*; the exercise of influence and the friendship of many distinguished persons made his life interesting and agreeable, and had it not been for the state of his health, Mallet du Pan and his family might have begun to look forward hopefully to the future. But already during the winter at Freiburg he had been troubled by a persistent cough, and his constitution, which had been undermined by his heroic struggle against public and private disaster, proved quite unable to resist the injurious effect of the climate of London, ‘*ce gouffre de vapeurs infernales*,’ as he somewhere calls it. The labour—which he confesses in his farewell words to his readers he ought never to have been so imprudent as to undertake, of engaging to supply every fortnight a political essay of sixty-four pages, under all circumstances of health, spirits, and public intelligence—could not, in spite of the assistance of friends, and especially of Malouet, be very long sustained; and it is marvellous that he was able to hold out for two years, and complete four volumes, which, containing as they do the ripest fruit of his genius and experience, retain to this day all their interest and force. The portrait still in the possession of his family, which was painted within six months of his death, is more like the portrait of a man of seventy than one of barely fifty. A letter to his friend Mr. Wickham, the Minister Plenipotentiary with the Allied Armies, describes in the most manly but touching terms his painful situation at this time, harassed as he was by the prospect of being unable to supply the wants of his family, or of leaving them in case of his

death in absolute penury, and wellnigh hopeless of the attempt which he was now making to obtain some assistance from the Government, 'such as an Englishman even does 'not always obtain after long public services.'

It is consolatory to know that his last days were made easier by the appointment of his son to a post at the Audit Office, and by an assurance from the Speaker, Mr. Addington, that the Government intended to make some provision for his wife—a provision which ultimately took the shape of a pension of 200*l.* a year on the Civil List; both considerable and unusual marks of favour and appreciation. Count Lally-Tollendal lent him his house at Richmond, and friendly offices were not wanting from other quarters. He lingered till May 1800, and his funeral was the occasion of a remarkable display of public and private sympathy.

With the death of Mallet du Pan the volume comes naturally to a close. Its chief interest, as we began by observing, is derived from its association with his name, but the extracts which have been given will have shown that it is not without a distinct charm and value of its own. The author possessed an unusual power of observing and depicting character, and a gift of wise reflection and comment, and he wrote in a graceful and simple style which is perfectly adapted to this species of composition, and which is very remarkable in one of foreign birth.

Having had occasion in this article to touch on the affairs of Geneva, which have more than once given premonitory warnings of greater events in Europe, we will not quit the subject without recommending to the notice of our readers another work relating to one of the leading citizens of the little republic, of which we give the title below.*

M. Pictet de Rochemont was the worthy representative of a family alike eminent in the annals of his native city and in the annals of science. Although his own tastes were essentially simple, domestic, and rural, he lived in times which compelled him to take an active part in the politics of Europe, since they threatened the very existence of Geneva. The patrician magistrates, who had been thrust aside by the Revolution, were the first and boldest to assert

* 'Biographie, Travaux, et Correspondance Diplomatique de C. Pictet de Rochemont, Député de Genève au Congrès de Vienne 1815, Envoyé extraordinaire de la Suisse à Paris et à Turin 1815 et 1816. (1755-1824).' Par Edmond Pictet. 8vo. Genève; 1892.

the independence of their country upon the cessation of the French occupation in 1814, and to cement the union of Geneva to the Confederation of Switzerland. At Paris and at Vienna the independence and neutrality of Switzerland were at stake, and it fell to the lot of M. Pictet de Rochemont to be their ardent and successful champion. He was thus brought into immediate contact with the sovereigns and ministers of the Great Powers, who treated him with the utmost consideration; and in that illustrious assemblage which met to decide the fate of Europe, it was acknowledged that none laboured with purer motives and a more patriotic spirit than the representative of Geneva. He displayed talents and virtues which would have done honour to the minister of an empire; and the record of the transactions in which he was engaged is a not unimportant contribution to history. This biography, therefore, which has been very ably drawn up and edited by M. Edmond Pictet, his grandson, will be read with interest; for it presents a picture of a life of singular intelligence and usefulness, adorned by the virtues implanted by the Reformation in the Protestant Republic, whose influence in the world has been out of all proportion to its diminutive territory.

ART. V.—1. *Schliemann's Excavations: an Archæological and Historical Study.* By DR. C. SCHUCHHARDT, &c., &c. Translated from the German by EUGENIE SELLERS. London and New York: 1891.

2. *Problems of Greek History.* By J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A. London: 1892.

THE completed life-work of the late Dr. Schliemann lies before us in its *résumé* by Dr. Schuchhardt, which has the benefit of an English version by Miss E. Sellers. All his major and two of his minor excavations have their results here condensed in the readable compass of about 300 pages, besides the first chapter, biographical, concerning the explorer himself. To the whole is prefixed an introduction by Mr. Walter Leaf, while two appendices give the latest results of the resumed excavations at Hissarlik, unhappily cut short by Dr. Schliemann's death in 1890; and some highly interesting details of two golden cups, richly decorated in *repoussé*, dug up at Amyclæ in 1889. Of the copiousness of the illustrations the reader may judge from the fact that their table of contents occupies nearly eight octavo pages.

These include plans, maps, and elevations of all the more important sites and buildings.

The record of Dr. Schliemann's work covers almost exactly twenty-one years. He laboured at Hissarlik in the Troad, 1870-3; at Mycenæ, 1874-6; at Hissarlik again, 1878-9; with a diversion to Ithaca, to fill up his time, in 1878. In 1880-1 we find him at Orchomenos and again in the Troad; in 1884 he just tapped Marathon, and then spent four months at Tiryns. He attempted Crete in 1887, but was baffled by the cupidity of the landowners and by the civil broils which distracted the island. The winters of 1886-7 and 1887-8 were spent in Egypt, and there his unflagging industry sent home considerable results to Germany. In 1888 he made excursions, spade in hand, to Cythera, Sphacteria, and 'the Sandy Pylos.' In 1890 he resumed work at Hissarlik, and was projecting its continuance in 1891, when he was called away from earthly labours. In his later years he enjoyed the collaboration of Professor Virchow and M. Burnouf, as also of Dr. Dörpfeld, who had gained experience in the excavations at Olympia. In the work down to 1878 he had only the co-operation, which seems never to have failed, of a wife who shared his enthusiasm.

The intervals which the above dates show were filled up by literary labours. As soon as he dropped the shovel Schliemann took up the pen. He wrote almost with an intoxication of glee, as though to call the world of *savants* to share his triumphs over time and oblivion. This spirit of rapture breaks out, naturally, most forcibly in his earlier works, and led him into inferences which scared for some time the sober ploddings of criticism. Larger views and deeper insight led him to correct and qualify later some of the crude conclusions of his first essays. But there breathes even through his premature conjectures and over-hazardous interpretations of his work a fresh breeze of delightful enthusiasm, which leaves the historical sceptic out of breath behind him. His method of flinging wide at once on the world of educated opinion his work, its results, and his own views concerning them, at every successive stage of his labours, made that work more impressive at the moment, if it left the views more open to immediate rebuke and subsequent correction.

The excavations are grouped in this volume not strictly in sequence of time, as shown above, but thus: 'Troy, Tiryns, Mycenæ, Orchomenos, Ithaca;' then follow the appen-

dices, in No. 1 of which Troy (Hissarlik) is resumed. Tiryns is, indeed, the structural key to both Troy and Mycenæ; but its relation to Troy was not so clear until the latest (1890) researches there established it. Leaving structural considerations for the present, the evidences, both in regard to their weight, their number, and their wide range of variety, concur in placing Mycenæ, alike in political and historical and, above all, in archæological importance, before the rest of the explored sites. To this accordingly 160 pages, or more than half the volume, are assigned.

The chief heads of these evidences are classifiable as follows: 1. The citadel and palace. 2. The six shaft-graves, with their miscellaneous contents, found in a circular area on the right of the road leading up to the former. 3. The *stelai*, sculptured and unsculptured, close in their neighbourhood. 4. Some valuable finds made by Dr. Schliemann outside the circular area, but within the citadel near it, consisting chiefly of golden vessels, signets, and terracotta objects. 5. The excavations of the Greek Archæological Society (1886), laying bare the details of the palace-area and supplementing No. 1. 6. The lower city, with the 'Treasury of Atreus' (so called) and other beehive tombs. 7. The graves of the populace in this lower city. The manifold character of this grand repertory of antique objects at Mycenæ justifies the foremost place which we here assign to that site. But before examining these heads of evidence in detail, it may be well to show the relation of the city and its dynasty to legend and to history.

The key to the early importance of Mycenæ lies in its situation, nearly equidistant between the two gulfs, that of Corinth or Naupactus (now Lepanto) northward, and that of Argos southward. This latter faces the broad valley of the river Inachos and receives its waters. This stream, with its chief affluent, the Cephisos, runs nearly north and south from a point somewhat north of Mycenæ, near Nemea. The river-valley narrows, funnel-wise, in its ascent northwards, as the hills on its east and west faces approach each other; but throws off on its eastern face a minor funnel valley, again narrowing between the sister ranges, of which the higher peaks, Elias and Szara, throw out each a torrent with its proper ravine towards the Cephisos. 'In the angle formed by these two ravines the soil rises to an isolated height of 912 feet' in an irregular triangle, or, rather, leg-of-mutton shape, tapering with its knuckle-end eastward, and its broader haunch-end south-westward, overlooking the lower

city, which slopes away from it on that side. From near the northern face of this platform of the Mycenæan citadel there diverges 'a perfect labyrinth of Cyclopean road-tracks, 'all intended to keep Mycenæ in communication with 'Corinth by the most varied routes.' The editor here raises the question whether we should 'consider Mycenæ to be an 'outpost of Corinth in its effort to reach Argos,' or whether its 'founders came from the Argolic Gulf' and established it as an *entrepôt* towards the Corinthian. The argument on either side (as stated p. 95) is rather plausible than convincing. But the general voice of the older legends groups Mycenæ with Argos and Tiryns, and points to an Asiatic source for Pelops, the head of its dynasty; while the name 'Perseus,' of its legendary founder, adds such confirmation as can be found in a name.* In the Homeric Catalogue of Forces, Corinth † is grouped, as well as Sicyon, near it and Cleonæ, midway between Corinth and Mycenæ, with the latter city under the personal lead of Agamemnon. But the legend of Bellerophon, told later in the poem by Glaucus, ‡ showing strong Asiatic affinities, and purporting to be a legend of two generations earlier than its narration, begins 'There is a city, Ephyre, in a corner of Argos,' and ends 'Let me not dishonour the race of my sires who became 'mighty chieftains both in Ephyre and in Lycia.' This suggests that the name 'Ephyre,' identified by tradition with Corinth, points to an older state of things, connecting the early settlement on the isthmus with an Asiatic source likewise, and probably superseded by the later ascendancy of Mycenæ. In the same Catalogue Argos and Tiryns § are placed with Hermione, Trœzen, and other cities on or near the Argolic Gulf, and with the island Ægina in a different group, under the command of Diomedes and others. Thucydides has no doubt of the Asiatic origin of Pelops, relying

* The device of Greek legend, in the case of distinguished immigrants who figure as founders of cities or dynasties, was to affiliate them to Zeus or Poseidon, effacing thus their real extraction, and nationalising their origin. Thus both Tantalus, father of Pelops, and Perseus are sons of Zeus. But another legend made Tantalus son of Tmolus, the eponym of the Lydian mountain; and Niobe, who has affinities with Mount Sipylus in the same region, is his daughter. The adventures of Perseus in legend, as noticed by Grote, vol. i. p. 89, 'bear a stamp almost Oriental.' Perhaps 'almost' might be better omitted.

† Il. ii. 569 foll.

‡ Il. vi. 152 foll.

§ Il. ii. 559 foll.

for it on 'the most authentic traditions he could find concerning the affairs of the Peloponnesians,' and adds that his great imported wealth was the source of his influence.* He also quotes the section preceding the Homeric Catalogue as 'the Demise of the Sceptre'† (of Pelops to Agamemnon) which conferred the 'sway over many islands and entire 'Argos.' This insular supremacy, he adds, implies naval power, which accounts for his being able to supply ships to the Arcadians. Earlier in the same chapter he recounts how Eurystheus was succeeded by Atreus, his viceroy in his absence at Mycenæ, and thus 'the Perseid dynasty superseded by the Pelopid.' A glance at the map shows at once the direct accessibility of Corinth, Argolis, and Laconia (the latter connected, by the brotherhood of its king Menelaüs, with Agamemnon and Mycenæ) to adventurers from the Asiatic side. The 'many islands,' which Homer puts first, and 'entire Argos' second, were probably the stepping stones to the latter; somewhat as in the Norman Conquest the Channel Islands were held by the victors before they invaded England itself. The close connexion of Argos with Mycenæ is illustrated in the historic period by the Heræum, or Temple of Here, which stood nearly midway between them, but nearer Mycenæ, and by the internecine jealousy which caused the demolition of Mycenæ by the Argives in 463 B.C.‡ The city had furnished a small patriotic contingent both at Thermopylæ and at Plataea,§ but its political effacement subsequently by Argos was complete.

We have been induced to devote some brief space to these traditional notices, owing to the contumelious way in which the entire legendary period of Greece is treated by its latest historian, Mr. Grote. He certainly had not the vast wealth of evidence which the researches conducted and stimulated by Dr. Schliemann have placed before us so lately. But there were facts within his ken which might have suggested limits to his distrust of tradition. Let us retrace a few of his utterances. Commenting on the testimony adduced by Thucydides, as above, from tradition, to the immigration, wealth, and influence of Pelops, he says:—

'The historian leaves out all the romantic interest of the genuine legends, preserving only this circumstance, which, without being better

* Thucyd. i. 9.

† ἐν τοῦ σκήπτρου ἅμα τῇ παραδόσει.—Thucyd. *ibid.*

‡ So Mr. Grote, v. 176, n. 1, after Clinton's 'Fasti.' The date given by Diodorus Siculus would be 468 B.C.

§ See Herod. vii. 202, ix. 28.

attested than the rest, carries with it from its common-place and prosaic character a pretended historical plausibility. . . . The introduction of so much sober and quasi-political history, unfortunately unauthenticated, contrasts strikingly with the highly poetical legends of Pelops and Atreus which precede and follow it.' (Vol. i. pp. 156, 157.)

Of the Trojan war itself he says that, although part of the universal faith of Hellas,

'it is in the eyes of modern inquiry essentially a legend and nothing more. If we are asked whether it be not a legend embodying portions of historical matter, and raised upon a basis of truth, . . . our answer must be that, as the possibility of it cannot be denied, so neither can the reality of it be affirmed.' (Ibid. p. 312.)

And, speaking again about what he calls the 'semi-historical theory of the myths,' i.e. the view taken of them by Thucydides, as above, he says:—

'In a society which has not yet formed the habit of recording its present, the real facts of the past can never be known; the difference between attested matter of fact and plausible fiction—between truth and that which is like truth—can neither be discerned nor sought for. . . . The Greek epic contains traditions respecting the past. . . . But what are these traditions? They are the matter of these songs and stories which have acquired a hold on the public mind; they are the creations of the poets and story-tellers themselves, each of whom finds some pre-existing and adds others of his own. . . . To assume a generic difference between the older and the newer strata of tradition—to treat the former as morsels of history and the latter as appendages of fiction—is an hypothesis gratuitous at the least, not to say inadmissible. For the farther we travel back into the past, the more do we recede from the clear day of positive history, and the deeper do we plunge into the unsteady twilight and gorgeous clouds of fancy and feeling.' (Pp. 416, 417.)

But, without examining in detail all the allegations in the above extracts, it must be conceded that, if there was a Trojan War at all—and the critic admits that 'the possibility of it cannot be denied'—it must have sprung from something like ordinary human motives and have been wrought out by ordinary human forces. We may assume that Thucydides, who expresses his limited trust in purely poetical sources, found what he thought irrefragable confirmation of that general fact in existing traditions and monuments. By a society 'recording its present' Mr. Grote, of course, refers to written records only. But the song or story in its earlier stage must be presumed to contain statements of real events then recent. It is incorrect, therefore, to regard the epic traditions as 'the creation of the poets and story-tellers themselves.' The 'famous

'deeds of men' still living, or but lately dead, are the text of fact with which the actual bards who figure in the *Odyssey* are represented as dealing.* The next generation of singers, assuming the above genesis of the epos in its primary germ, then adds, interweaves, and adorns, and successive generations continue the process. But that primary germ is one of objective events and persons real and recent. It is, therefore, incorrect to say that to discriminate between 'the 'older and the newer strata of tradition' involves an undue assumption. That the criteria of our analysis may be defective, and that we cannot eliminate error from the result, is a very different thing from saying that 'the 'older and the newer' are equally doubtful. Take, however, as an instance in which the growth of a myth is traced by the critic himself,† that of Meleager, the Ætolian chieftain, told by Phoenix in the *Iliad*.‡ There is not a single detail which need raise a doubt of its being a veritable narrative. The ascribing the ravages of the boar to the wrath of Artemis no more detracts from the credibility than the personification of Pallas by Phye in the narrative of the return of Peisistratus casts doubt on the historical fact of that return.§ The critic then goes on to show how from Hesiod to Euripides the legend grew, by including this, that, and the other *motif* with the primary germ. The same process might be traced, if we compared the Homeric narrative of the death of Agamemnon and its consequences, with their expanded result in the dramatists, when those two fruitful germs of pathos, the ancestral curse transmitted and the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, had become included with the earlier version. Thus, as we re-ascend the stream of tradition, we reach a point above the confluence of tributaries; and, instead of 'a deeper plunge into the unsteady twilight and 'gorgeous clouds,' we emerge into a medium more steady and consistent. We find less of the alloy and more in proportion of the primitive metal.

Even on literary grounds only, to which he injudiciously limited himself, Mr. Grote maintained, in Milton's words, which he quotes, 'too strict an incredulity.' There are some features, for instance, in the Homeric Catalogue referred to above which suggest for it the character of a genuine document preserved in memory. The following

* Hom. Od. i. 351, 352; viii. 74 foll., 492 foll.; cf. Il. ix. 189.

† Grote's 'Greece,' i. 139 foll. ‡ ix. 530 foll.

§ Herod. i. 60.

very curious result of a comparison of a fragment of Charon, an historiographer older than Herodotus, preserved by Plutarch,* with a passage in Herodotus himself and with a line in the Catalogue shows one of these. The birthplace of Charon was Lampsacus on the Hellespont, and the fragment states that the place was earlier known as Pityeia, i.e. Pine-tree City, and explains the change of name by an anecdote of savage adventure resembling that of Captain Smith and Pocahontas. Herodotus tells us that Croesus, enraged with the Lampsacenes, threatened that he 'would rub out 'Lampsacus like a pine-tree'†—a dark menace which bewildered the intended victims, and was explained by some local sage on the ground of some supposed character or quality in the pine-tree itself. This shows that in the time of Herodotus the name Pityeia was wholly lost, or he could not have failed to allude to it as throwing light at any rate on one side of the obscure saying (*πίτυς, Πιτυεία*) of Croesus.

But the Pityeians appear in the Catalogue not as Greek contingents, but allies of Troy.‡ Earlier, therefore, than the Ionian colonisation of Pityeia by the Phœceans, which cannot easily be placed later than the seventh century B.C., must this primitive designation of that place have been, thus pointing back to a time when its connexions were purely Asiatic. Only in a genuine list, which kept touch with early facts, could such a note of authenticity occur. But, again, we have the astounding fact that the grand bifurcation of the Hellenic race into Dorian and Ionian is in this Catalogue wholly blank. The only suggestion there of either is the solitary 'Dorion' (if, indeed, it be such and not a fortuitous homonym) in the domain of the Pylian Nestor.§ The Ionians are only named in a later book, and that with an epithet which seems to mark effeminacy.|| Elis and the neighbourhood are mentioned without any suggestion of the Olympian festival; whereas the poet seems to seek such allusions to local celebrity, as in the mention of Thamyras and the Muses referred to in the above note. Neither is there, in spite of the grand opportunities of the athletic contests in Il. xxiii. and Odys. viii., any reference whatever to such Olympic

* See Creuzer, *Hist. Græc. Fragm.* p. 108.

† *πίτυος τρόπον ἐκτίψειν* (Herod. vi. 37).

‡ Il. ii. 829: *Καὶ Πιτυέων ἔχον καὶ Τηριήν: ὄρος αἰπύ.*

§ Il. ii. 594, 595, connected with the legend of Thamyras and his impious challenge to the Muses, and their judgement upon him.

|| *Ἰάονες ἐλαγχίτωνες* (Il. xiii. 685).

celebration as drew historic Hellas periodically into one. More remarkable still are the features of the first item in the Catalogue. There the Bœotian towns are grouped under five leaders, but their number should probably have been thirty. It is, in fact, twenty-nine. What, then, has become of the thirtieth?

That city which should have been first and is nowhere, is no other than the famous Thebes. To make the omission more marked yet, we find 'a lower or lesser Thebes' (Ἰπποθῆβαι) actually mentioned. Does not this suggest that the war of the Epigoni, ending in the immediate and temporary effacement of Thebes from Bœotia, was a notorious fact of history at the date of the Catalogue? By the period of Xerxes, Thebes was restored and thoroughly Hellenised. The grave charge of 'Medism' brought against it, after the patriotic victories of the Greeks, from Marathon to Plataea, had left them awhile united in sentiment, shows a state of things utterly changed from that of the Homeric period. In Homer the Thebes of the then recent past is a great and powerful, but alien city. Its people are always 'Cadmeians,' of marked inferiority in prowess to the standard of Achæan heroism.* But in the living scenes of the Iliadic present Thebes and its people are absolutely blotted from the map. The separation of the 'Minyeian Orchomenos,'† with one sister town, from the Bœotian territory and its leaders, whereas Thucydides reckons it as Bœotian.‡ shows a standpoint in time when the *origines* of the various blends of race were still in fresh memory. Once more, Athens stands under its single leader, with fifty ships, utterly alone, with not a single secondary or associated town ascribed to it. This again suggests that the incorporation of the Attic demes under a single political headship, traditionally ascribed to Theseus, was a fact exerting a special stringency, such as to suppress for a time the individuality even of Eleusis and Brauron. The facts point to radii of distribution, some of them racial rather than political; all of them prehistoric, and yet fitting into various consequences in the historical period, as well as showing undesigned coincidences with legendary stories. This Catalogue gives very little scope, by the nature of its contents, to the poetical imagination. It

* Il. iv. 385-398.

† Il. ii. 511.

‡ Ὀρχομενὸς ὁ Βοιωτικὸς (Thucyd. iii. 87). But Pindar, Ol. xiv. 4, recognises the βασιλῆαι χάριτες Ὀρχομενοῦ παλαιγόνων Μινυῶν ἐπίσκοποι.

is impossible to ascribe it to the 'inner consciousness' of the story-teller. Of course it may have been garbled or interpolated in the local interests of later times; and Solon is in fact charged with inserting a line to countenance the claim of the Athenians to Salamis. But this only shows that in the unwritten ages, while living wholly on the lips of the minstrel, it had the character of a charter conveying territorial rights, as by title deeds valid in the present. It contains, in fact, in reference to the war, some of the attributes at once of our Domesday Book and of the roll of Battle Abbey in reference to the Norman Conquest, which latter has been similarly manipulated in family interests, probably to a far greater extent than the Homeric Catalogue. Chieftains and their courtly guests might indeed derive amusement at their banquets from such 'plausible fiction' as Mr. Grote saw in the Greek legends; but, with all their childlike simplicity of faith in their heroes, the ancient Greeks of the historic period were not quite such simpletons as to decide broad public questions touching territory and political precedence by the mere inspiration of the muse at the convivial moment. Traditions and monuments are built into one another; and the Greeks had both. If Athenians and Spartans, Ionians and Dorians, of the post-Olympiac period, revered such a præ-Olympiac charter as the Homeric Catalogue, which cut so clean across most of their lines of demarcation in the then present, we may be sure that they did so by virtue of traditions and monuments, confirmatory of it and of each other, which the voice of universal Hellas recognised as valid and trustworthy:—

φύμη ἔ' οὔτις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἦντινα πολλοὶ
λαοὶ ωημύωσαν θεῶν νό τις ἔστι καὶ ἀντή.*

The war and the Catalogue must, taken broadly, stand together on the basis either of fiction or of fact. But the above considerations show a grave prosaic presumption in favour of the genuineness of the Catalogue. But if this latter be true, it follows necessarily that, until some evidence arises to show that it was drawn up for some other purpose than the Tale of Troy and surreptitiously foisted into it, that Tale must, in its large political outline, and in some of its tribal and territorial details, be true also.

Next, as regards the war itself, one would like an answer to the question, if the Tale of Troy be dismissed to the region

of fable, what was there in known experience or in the bent of the national genius, to suggest to a poet a universal combination of all tribes and races from Thessaly to Cape Malea, from Rhodes to Ithaca, in a fiction of aggressive war upon Asia? Down to the period of Macedonian hegemony there is, from first to last, nothing in the relations of those tribes and races to suggest it. It is Asia united under one sway from the Indus to the Ægean Sea which we find in history, pushing to the west, not a united Hellas pushing to the east. And Persian aggression found Greeks not united, but divided, as did Roman intervention later. Only by the most resolute efforts of a few rare patriots could a nucleus of union at the Persian period be kept together; and almost before the pressure of Persian menace is removed, jealousies and rivalries break out. The earlier Dorian invasion, the determination of Sparta and Athens, by its consequences, into two foci of opposite influences and tendencies, the effacement of Messenian independence by three successive wars full of festering recollections, the obliteration of Mycenæ by Argos, the struggle of the Ionians against Persian power, in which, save for a futile effort made by Athens, they were left to be crushed without support,—are all so many antagonistic testimonies to the popularity of united effort in a common cause. The whole tendency which they reveal is not centripetal, but centrifugal. There is nothing to suggest such a union as the Trojan war implies and its tale asserts; there was in fact, rather, everything against it, if there had not been a root of fact out of which it sprang.

All these presumptions and probabilities Mr. Grote seems to have passed over *sicco pede*. But he had some external evidence of monuments too, although far less than has lately accrued. The massive walls and colossal gallery at Tiryns, the Gate of Lions at Mycenæ, its enormous vault, the 'Treasury of Atreus,' built of mutually approaching slabs, the stupendous blocks of its ruined walls, and many of these primitive features of masonry repeated in Ithaca, had already been the wonder of travellers, from Pausanias to Sir W. Gell. Surely they evidence, like the Pyramids of Egypt, some considerable world-power, with its chief seat in eastern Peloponnesus, perfectly adequate to form the material basis of a political combination such as that which the Tale of Troy postulates. Mr. Grote seems to pass these by without the attempt to strike the spark of evidence from their stones.

Before touching even the outline of civilisation and art

which the Mycenæan excavations have enabled us to draw, we leap at once to that question of date which lies always at the heart of antiquarian research. After remarking, 'This civilisation must assuredly have lasted for centuries. The walls of Tiryns are considerably older than those of 'Mycenæ' (p. 315); and adding that the walls of the latter represent the whole period from the first to the latest of the 'shaft-graves' within the circular area, and the levelling up of that precinct, Dr. Schuchhardt continues:—

'Even with the latest shaft-grave we are still in an older period than that represented by the oldest objects in the finds from the rest of the citadels, such as the golden goblets and rings (figured on pp. 276, 277, Nos. 280, 281). . . . Finally comes the repairing of the town wall' (in close fitting four or five-sided blocks, as shown vertically, p. 137, No. 136). ' . . . For all this development we must not allow less than from two to three hundred years.' (P. 316.)

He proceeds to derive approximate data from (1) bits of Mycenæan pottery found in the island of Thera, under a layer of volcanic ashes, referred by geologists to about 1500 B.C.; (2) an Egyptian scarabæus, with dating inscription, found in the Mycenæan palace (which, however, may have been brought thither at any time *after* the date it bears—thirteenth century B.C.); (3) a similar scarabæus 'found among Mycenæan objects at Rhodes' (obviously open to the same remark); (4) some Mycenæan vases found in the Fayum (Egypt), lying with royal cartouches dated 1400–1500 B.C. (but here, too, the vases may have been deposited long after); and—

(5) 'Finally, in the grave of Aa Hotep, the mother of Ah Mose, who freed Egypt from the Hyksos (about 1600), a sword was found worked in relief, . . . exactly in the style of the Mycenæan blades. Since model and copy cannot be very far apart, we thus get the fifteenth or sixteenth century B.C. as the earliest date for this Mycenæan work.' (Ibid.)

Of these criteria the first and last are the only ones which yield approximately an absolute date, and they fairly confirm one another. The writer goes on to trace in the style of art a 'dependence on Asiatic motives,' and the results of 'an active trade with Egypt;' and confirms these conclusions from the acknowledged Greek legendary heroes, all immigrants—Perseus and Pelops from the islands and Lydia, and Danaüs from Egypt.

We further read: 'This period, from about 1400 to 1000 B.C., would exactly suit for the Homeric Achæans. Its end would coincide with the date at which, by general

‘agreement, the Dorians entered the Peloponnesus, seized the Achæan strongholds, and crushed their ancient glory.’

It is then further shown that the area of Mycænæan civilisation does not, and need not, correspond with that of the Achæan name. Still, if the former area included the political centre of gravity of the latter at Mycenæ itself, that would spread a determining influence, of course unequally diffused, over the whole. Undisturbed in the islands by the Dorian invasion, ‘the Mycænæan style’ there ‘underwent a ‘regular developement,’ leading, in an unbroken chain, from the sixth to the fourth century B.C., to the purest Greek. In this civilisation we have ‘a glimpse of a seething mixture ‘of elements,’ Phrygian, Carian, Egyptian, and insular, from which a new whole was formed on a new soil; while that civilisation ‘was developed through lively intercourse ‘among all the tribes dwelling in and around the Archipelago.’ These facts seem to bridge that sea, and conduct us to Troy. For

‘with this picture the Trojan war finds its explanation. The chief condition for the establishment of Minos’ naval supremacy was the abolition of piracy, and this was attained by the subjugation of the Carians. . . . But the previous disturbers of the peace need not have been Carians only. The rape of Helen from the European coast to Troy has now long been regarded as a figurative expression for an act of piracy.’ (P. 320.)

The remains found at Troy (Hissarlik) are mostly of an older and ruder type. They are almost destitute of anything approaching the human or even animal form, nearer than the clumsiest moulding or the most uncouth delineation, and even these are most rare. But towards the end of the great Mycænæan period its style appears at Troy also, a connexion in time is established, and a contact of that city, shortly before its overthrow, with the same zone of art. The golden age of each spot just touches hands across the Ægean, after which loss of importance at one and total ruin at the other ensues. On that common golden age the poet takes his stand, and the Homeric standard of arts and manners is drawn from its traditions, sometimes with a thoroughness of knowledge which admits of close verification.

According to Thucydides, Greek settlements in Asia were unwall'd up to Xerxes’ time. But Homer knows of cities walled, towered, and gated. His Scæan gates, with a platform of view commanding the plain, ‘answer exactly to the ‘oldest city gate discovered at Hissarlik.’ So within the

walls we find—to be further corroborated from Tiryns and Mycenæ—all the chief palatial features of the poems reflected in the cleared ground-plan of the actual palaces. The one point of domestic manners diverging from the Homeric is to be noted in the separate women's hall, or *gynæceium*, traced on the plans facing pp. 132 and 298. Of this, unless in the Asiatic surroundings of Priam's palace, Homer knows nothing. The perfectly free association of the sexes at the courts of Menelaüs and Alcinoüs and that of Zeus above, conspicuous in the proceedings of Here, in 'Il.' xv. 85-150, is the foremost feature in the poet's social code. The question is too long to argue by analysis of passages here, but anyone may judge from the character and bearing of Nausicaä in the 'Odyssey,' in such strong contrast with that, say, of Antigone in the opening scene of the 'Phœnissæ,' that the hot-bed of a *gynæceium* was incapable of rearing such a free flower of maiden bloom as we find in Nausicaä. Another divergence lies in the cremation of the Homeric corpse, whereas the interment at Mycenæ was, it now seems, that of the body entire, portions of it being even found 'in a mummified condition' (p. 158). Iron, also, where its Homeric use is apparent, is mostly used for tools and weapons, but in Mycenæ for ornamental work, and near the end of the period only. But the points of contact between Mycenaean personal accoutrements and decoration and Homeric art are many and curious. Metal predominates in Homeric material for cup, tripod, armour, and equipment, and even palace wall-plates; and so at Mycenæ too. Even in belts, girdles, baldrics, where convenience would suggest some more flexible substance, metal, and of metals gold, is both Homeric and Mycenaean. At Mycenæ gold stands, save for weapons and household utensils, supreme, and all but universally dominates. Some of the 'shaft-graves' were strewn about with a perfect Danaë-shower of gold flakes, gold discs, and gold buttons. Silver is comparatively rare. On Mycenæ alone of cities Homer bestows an epithet of wealth in gold (*πολύχρυσος*). Troy had been so in the earlier time of peace, but war had wasted its treasures. We pass from material to fashion and pattern. Those which arrest the eye at Mycenæ on a surface-glance are the circular and spiral. So in Homer, wherever any definite type can be fixed, it is by words of corresponding tenor (*δινωτήν, ἀμφιδεδίνηται*). We have figured at p. 241, No. 240, a cup, two-handed, with, on either handle, a sipping dove. The poet just doubles the number of handles in Nes-

tor's massive cup to make *four* ('cars,' they are called), each between a *pair* of doves, which seemed dipping their beaks in the contents. The elements of decoration are identical, only multiplied. The Mycenaean cups are joined with numerous rivets, not soldered; so is Nestor's. The latter had two bases (*πυθμένες*) below—a term which has puzzled commentators. A cup from Hissarlik showed an oval ridge below, forming a socket-foot, to steady it on the table; thus, again, duplicated in romance. The same had a lip for pouring either way, one large, one small—a veritable *ἀμφικύπελλον*—a term equally obscure until this light of three thousand years ago was thrown upon it. At Hissarlik, also, was found a key of copper,* the handle of which, of less durable material, had perished; compare the key of Penelope's treasure-chest, also of copper, with a handle of ivory.†

It will be remembered how in Agamemnon's royal accoutrements serpent or 'dragon' forms prevail. They crowd his corselet and twine along his shield-belt. In the fourth tomb at Mycenæ were found part of the stem and the handle of a sceptre (Nos. 250, 251), the latter fashioned into a finely executed head of a golden dragon with open jaws. The sceptre of Agamemnon is in the passage already referred to described only generally as 'ever imperishable' (*ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ*), being the work of Hephaestus, the Fire-god, to whom all specially curious and artistic achievements are referred, as, notably, the panoply and shield-devices of Achilles. The sheathing of the staff was found in the same grave, detached; a hollow cylinder of golden openwork, quatre-foiled (No. 250), leaf touching leaf by their points alone, and each glazed with a facet of rock-crystal, which material glistened also in every scale of the dragon. The whole is not unworthy of being the reputed work of a deity, and the actual heirloom of a hero line. The device of the sceptre in the tomb matches that of the corselet in the poem. Homer is the one poet of the world in whom such a coincidence would be possible. Assuming, then, this to be the

* Troy and its Remains, p. 333.

δέπας περικαλλές ὃ οἴκοθεν ἦγ' ὃ γεραίως
 χρυσεῖοις ἦλοισι πεπαρμένον' οὐατα δ' αὐτῷ
 τέσσαρ' ἔσαν, ἰοαὶ δὲ πελειάδες ἀμφὶ ἑκάστον
 χρύσειαι νεμέθοντο, οὕω δ' ὑπὸ πυθμένεσσι ἦσαν. Il. xi. 632-5.
 εἶλετο δὲ κληῖδ' εὐκαμπέα χειρὶ παχείῃ
 κληῖν χαλκήνῃν· κῶπη δ' ἐλέφαντος ἐπ' ἦεν. Od. xxi. 6, 7.

cognisance (as heralds would call it) of the royal house of Mycenæ, the burial of the sceptre would be a suitable symbol of the local extinction of that house. Pausanias * records the tradition that in the days of Tisamenus, son of Orestes, that extinction took place by the Dorian Heracleid invasion, Tisamenus and his children being driven out to 'what is now Achaia.' If, according to a Spartan tradition recorded by Herodotus,† Orestes was buried elsewhere, the sceptre on which Agamemnon leant when he bespake the 'hero 'Danai' ‡ might have been deposited in the royal 'shaft-grave,' not only through a faithful sentiment of sorrowing loyalty towards a dynasty extinguished, but to prevent its passing into the hands of alien rivals. Thus the traditions and the fact are fairly in accord. Compare then with both the emphasis of the description given in Homer, who makes the sceptre pass through the hands of three gods and then of three hero-kinsmen to those of the King of Men—a demise, traced step by step, which at once shows a strong significance attaching to it, and attests its rare preciousness as a marvel of art. It is as though the poet appealed to the mighty dead to vindicate from the grave the truth of song, and reclaimed these royal insignia as the credentials of his muse.

The only conspicuous points of contact with the poet shown by the remains, in respect of defensive armour, are to be found in the helmet and shield, but as represented in works of art, not in the actual objects discovered. Of the helmet little can be said, save that it leaves the face very much exposed and has an abnormal developement of crest and crest-socket. But the prominence constantly given to these ornamental appendages in Homeric accoutrements may be said to be no more than proportionately represented in the helmets of a file of warriors from a vase and a small intaglio representing a duel (p. 281, No. 284, and p. 196, No. 178). But the most characteristic type of shield is one which could not possibly be better expressed than by the Homeric ἀμφιβρότη. It literally seems to 'enclose the man.' By slightly stooping,

* ii. 18, § 7.

† i. 67, 68.

‡ See II. ii. 100–110:—

ἀνὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
ἔσθη σκῆπτρον ἔχων, τὸ μὲν Πφαιστος κάμει τεύχων.

τῷ δ' ὄγ' ἐρυσάμενος ἔπε' Ἀργείοισι μετῆύδα,
ὡ φίλοι, ἥρωες Δαναοί, θεράποντες Ἀργεος, κ.τ.λ.

even his head would disappear below its capacious rim. See especially the same intaglio just referred to, where it looks something like an enormous dish-cover; and a hunting group on a sword-blade (p. 229, No. 227), where on one of the figures it is well developed, but each side seems to have a double curve, pinched in the middle, like that of the capital B. A fragment* of such a shield, actually found, or, perhaps one end of it, made of wood, is shown on p. 269, No. 276. The helmet and shield together are just shown so far as to be recognisable on a tantalising triangular morsel of 'Egyptian 'porcelain' from the third shaft-grave (p. 208, No. 198). It shows the profile of a warrior looking out over the rim of a huge shield, with an expression of alarm or surprise, alike in the eye and the lip, so perfectly natural as to leave far behind all other human delineations contained in the volume.†

'The helmet is low, and fits closely to the head. It consists of several superimposed bands, each of which is separately plaited, probably out of leather thongs. Over the ear can be seen the chin-strap. On the top . . . and to the front is an appendage shaped like a horn; the remnant of a second appendage can be seen to the centre.' (P. 208.)

An Egyptian monument is then compared, showing an exten, perhaps Sardinian head-piece, a close-fitting skull-cap, 'with a horn to the back and front, and a knob in the middle,' making it supposable that these features of crista-tion, &c., came from Asia Minor to Mycenæ—exactly i.e. as did Pelops himself.

We must refer to the original work of Dr. Schliemann on Mycenæ for some of the details following, as in one or two instances above. *Mycènes*, No. 369, shows a baldric ending in two straps, like our modern 'braces,' precisely suited therefore for the arrangement of weapons ascribed to Agamemnon, whose 'knife hung close to the sheath of his great sword.'‡ Three such suspenders (*ἀοπήρες*, Hom.) were found, all of gold; also a greave-mounting of the same metal, with which compare the Homeric *ἐπισφύριον*; while fifteen sword-blades with great golden hilts expressively illustrate Homer's epithet *κωπήεις* § for that weapon.

* We should rather speak of it as many fragments, for so it was found. These have since been carefully pieced together in one.

† The text *ad loc.* leaves these striking characteristics without notice—so singular an omission, that one is tempted to ask whether they are due in any degree to the superior skill of the modern engraver.

‡ Il. iii. 271, 272.

§ Il. xv. 713.

Again, negatively, Homer nowhere mentions any guard on his swords. The Mycenæan sword figured in the present work (p. 232, No. 228; cf. p. 267, No. 272) has indeed a guard, but wholly without prominence, and having but the slightest lateral projections. Even the minute details of the golden diadems from Mycenæ, which were fixed on the head by a pin and tube, have their match in the golden clasp of Odysseus' cloak with its 'twin tubes.'* Also the miniature hunting-scene on a golden plate, probably a scabbard-ornament, is paralleled by that on the same Odyssean clasp, of hound and fawn, with vivid attitudes and lifelike expression.† Dr. Schliemann similarly ascribes to the stag, pursued on the scabbard-plate by a lion, 'a face full of anguish,' as it gazes round on its pursuer. Golden pins were found among the *mundus muliebris* in the fifth grave; and with such the goddess Here attaches her robe in Homer.‡ Decorative amber was found in profusion at Mycenæ. It occurs frequently in the adornment of Homer's ladies. Even the minute distinction ascribed to the vessels of presentation by the poet—that they had *not* 'known the fire,' § is reflected from the tomb. Three of five large copper cauldrons showed marks of fire, the other two were *ἄπυροι*. Menelaüs presents Telemachus with a cup 'of massy silver, finished at the lips with gold;' and at Mycenæ were found two, one entirely of silver, the other of silver but with a copper rim, precisely so plated. It is in these minute details, however trivial the object, that the most effective proof lies of Homer having before his eyes what is known as Mycenæan art. Again, at Mycenæ

'iron is met with for the first time in the form of a few finger-rings, which show that this metal was considered costly, and only worked into trinkets. Of great importance, finally, are three bronze safety-pins, for up to now one was forced to believe that the Mycenæans, contrary to Homeric and Greek custom, only wore sewn garments, and on this ground their connexion with later Greeks was questioned. The pins found are of the most primitive shape. . . . This discovery

* . . . περόνη χρυσοῖο τέτυκτο
αὐλοῦσι καὶ ὕμνοισι.

Od. xix. 226-7.

† . . . τὸ δὲ θαυμάζεσκον ἅπαντες,
ὥς οἱ χρύσειοι ἔοντες, ὃ μὲν λάει νεβρόν ἀπάγχων,
αὐτὰρ ὃ ἐκφογείν μεμῶς ἤσπαιρε πύεσσιν.

Ibid. 229-31.

‡ χρυσεῖης ἐνετῆσι. Il. xiv. 180.

§ ἐπεὶ ἀπύρους τρίποδας, Il. ix. 122; λέβητα . . . λευκὸν ἔτ' αὐτῶς, xxiii. 267-8; φιάλην ἀπύρωτον, ibid. 270; λέβητ' ἄπυρον, 885.

teaches us that towards the end of the Mycenæan period, even as in Homeric and later Greece, garments were formed by square pieces of stuff wrapped round the body and pinned over the shoulders.'

The iron may probably have been found only in small lumps, as it may even now be picked up on our Sussex coast. The art of welding securely, or smelting it into large masses, comes much later in metallurgy. This accounts for the 'trinket' form. Homerists will remember that 'grey iron'* stands last in the list of the classified prizes proposed by Achilles in the funeral games, and that two samples of it occur: one a native lump of massive ore,† supposed pure or nearly so—the fortunate owner of which, 'though he were a landed man of many 'acres, would never lack iron for shepherd's or ploughman's 'uses for five years together;' the other, a double set of axe-heads and half axe-heads, ten of each, and all of iron.‡ Its precious character is clear from its honourable place on this occasion.§

The dominant art-motives, however, which the Mycenæan and Tirynthian objects reveal, accord singularly with the Homeric both negatively and positively. Several of these seemed capable at first of a theomythical interpretation, and various critics adopted that key to them, *e.g.* the Tirynthian wall-piece of man and bull; || the curious, highly antique signet, with its seemingly bearded females and *bizarre* costumes; and what Dr. Schliemann at first took for the 'owl-headed Pallas' and the 'cow-headed Here' at Hissarlik and at Tiryns (p. 128, Nos. 126, 127). These latter seem the rudest efforts of 'the 'prentice hand' of early art to mould the human form. Were they not kept designedly at that primitive standard of clumsiness, as in things divine the

* Il. xxiii. 261. † *σόλον αὐτοχόωρον*, *ibid.* 826; cf. 832-5.

‡ *Ibid.* 850, 851.

§ It is probable that the axle and club to which the epithet *σιδήρεος* belongs in Homer (Il. v. 723; vii. 141, 144) were merely armed or shod with iron, and thus that its use in small parcels only is to be understood. In the case of the chariot axle, being that of the goddess, we must allow perhaps for a theurgic marvel transcending human skill. The iron money of the Dorians and the iron bars used as currency among Cæsar's Britons (Cæsar, *De Bello Gallico*, v. 12) arose from the same fact of the early preciousness of iron. The Dorians, tenacious conservatives, clung to it in spite of its depreciation; among the Britons it was not improbably still a precious metal when the Roman invader discovered them using it.

|| P. 120, No. 111.

human mind submits more slowly to changed types and clings to its ugly antiques as more venerable than modern refinements? They are at any rate unworthy of the name of art, beside the skilfully inlaid designs in sword-blades (p. 229, No. 227, and p. 266, Nos. 270, 271) and the graceful scroll-patterns of interiors at Mycenæ, Tiryns, and Orchomenos. It remains, then, that the highest and most successful motive of the Mycenæan artist was the form of bird or beast. The seals, *intagli*, and wall-paintings, and especially the two beautifully embossed cups, described in Appendix II., 'from the Vapheio tomb near Amyclæ, which for originality of design and delicacy of execution are unrivalled, except perhaps by the finest goldsmith's work of the Italian 'Renaissance' (p. 350), show the artist at his zenith of felicitous inspiration. But even in these cups the human figures and the trees lack the vigour and freedom of the bulls. This intense appreciation of animal forms in Mycenæan and contemporary art runs parallel with the love of Homer for animals in simile. The same creaturely instinct pervades both. In Homeric simile the nobler brutes seem taken into partnership with humanity, and become the reflex and the index of human action, suffering, and emotion. So the Mycenæan artist speaks his mind most clearly in the quadruped, and seems to convey into it an intensity of action corresponding to the tension of effort in himself; and correspondingly, representative art knows nothing of mythology among its motives either at Mycenæ or in Homeric description. On the shield of Achilles the war-god Ares, Pallas Athene, and the fiends of battle, Strife, Uproar, and the rest, appear in the *mêlée* of carnage, because in the poet's conception they join as agents in the actual strife and move in the plane of the human combatants. They do not appear projected on a celestial zone, serene and adorable, as in later conceptions, when theom mythology became a leading instinct of art; for instance, on the throne of the Pheidian Zeus at Olympia, or the earlier one of Apollo at Amyclæ, or, to take a closer example, on the shield and armour of Achilles as described by Euripides. In this last we have Hermes the messenger-god, Perseus with the Gorgon's head, the Sun presented 'on winged steeds,' the Sphinx and the Chimæra. In Homer's shield, sun, moon, and stars are objects of nature, shining above man and his works or his rest, by day and night, as they do in every scene of life. Thus the spirit which moved the poet of the Iliad seems to breathe in the artist of the Mycenæan period. Nowhere else has poetry or

art so ennobled the brute creature. One might almost construct a 'beast-epic' from Iliadic simile, and furnish an illustrated edition from lately recovered Mycenæan designs.

We have dwelt thus long on what the reader may deem the anise and cummin of a great archæological question passed, as it were, through the Homeric sieve. But the memory and the services, so inestimable to archæology, of Dr. Schliemann demand this treatment. We can only put ourselves in a position to do him justice by assuming the Homeric standpoint and adopting that poetic interest which stimulated and guided his labours as an explorer. But further, the more minute the features recognisable, the more complete the identity which they establish between the Homeric and the Mycenæan civilisation. These minutiae are like the finer tooling in the water-mark of the genuine bank note, which distinguishes it from the fabrication. One might read through and through the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, or the *Post-Homerica* of Quintus Smyrnæus, without lighting, in all their stagy antique, on a single such decisive feature, broad or fine, as arrests us in nearly every page of the older and grander poems. The negative evidence, moreover, confirms the positive. For instance, the total absence of script in these relics of early Levantine civilisation is confirmed by writing being left among the arts of life a total blank by Homer. The shipmaster there has no record of his cargo, but carries it in his memory.* The one famous passage which seems exceptional is, in fact, confirmatory. The 'signs,' written or pictured, which, to his own bane,† Bellerophon bears, are spoken of as some feat of magic mystery might be. They are sent between a Greek prince of Asiatic affinity and his Lycian kinsman, and affect the mind of the latter as a malignant spell might be supposed by believers in magic to do.‡ It seems plain that of writing, as conveying mental suggestion by language, the poet had no notion. The art lay wholly outside his horizon.

Having made thus clear the relation between the standard of Mycenæan civilisation and that of the Homeric poems, we return to the seven chief heads of evidence under which the

* φόρου μνήμων, Od. viii. 163.

† σήματα λυγρά, Il. vi. 168.

‡ γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῶ θυμοφθόρα πολλά, ibid. 169. By the epithet θυμοφθόρα, either 'poisoning (as we say) the mind' of the receiver, or 'baneful to the life' (θυμός) of the bearer, may be meant. The former, as more direct, seems in Homer preferable.

results of excavation at Mycenæ were arranged above; and for our present purpose the work of the Greek Archæological Society may be taken as one with that of Schliemann. Thus Nos. 1 and 5 of those heads, as above stated (p. 401), are in what follows grouped together. They relate to the citadel and its palace. Passing by some 'massive ancient walls' on the summit of that area, which proved to be the foundations of a Doric temple of the sixth or seventh century B.C., we reach, within the layer of *débris*, ten feet deep, on which they rested, *two* 'walls of two different ancient periods.' Those at the lower level must, of course, be the earlier; they are 'stronger and better built,' and were found to yield

'exactly the same ground-plan which the finds at Troy and Tiryns had shown to be the typical one for the main divisions of the Homeric palace—viz. a large hall with two ante-rooms, a stately courtyard, and several smaller apartments; the whole was surrounded by a wall of great strength, and approached from the lower city by two roads.' (Pp. 286-7.)

The approaches were, of course, so contrived as to yield the maximum of protection to defenders and of exposure to assailants, a narrow defile between wall and tower leaving the enemy open to missile weapons on each flank. The famous 'Lions' Gate,' slightly narrowing towards the top, is nearly ten feet wide by over ten high, and its external approach has a width of more than twenty-seven feet. Its aspect and features are among the best known of the representations of ancient art. But we learn that 'in Phrygia Professor Ramsay has found two lions exactly similar to those of Mycenæ on either side of a column above the door of a rock tomb; and on a carved ivory handle from Menidi we seem to behold a faithful copy of the great relief of the gate.' (P. 142.)

A note here tells us of 'as many as eight of these heraldic groups of lions' found in Phrygia, which 'generally guard a column.' Whatever may be the association with a family or a dynasty which the word 'heraldic' would imply, the legend of the close connexion of the ruling race at Mycenæ with Western Asia receives from the above facts as strong a corroboration as art can convey through monuments. Themselves immigrants from that Asiatic region into the Greek peninsula, what is more natural than that, as their power grew and spread itself on its new area, they should turn their views of war and conquest back on the Asiatic soil whence they had come? The Mycenæan lions are carved on a triangular slab, set over the lintel of the

principal gate. The minor gate towards the western end of the citadel's northern wall is crowned with a similar but unsculptured slab. Its approach is similarly contrived to expose assailants on either flank.

We pass on, again grouping our Nos. 2 and 3, to the area of the shaft-graves and its monuments. On the right of the entrance road from the Lions' Gate to the palace was found, on clearing away some ten or more feet of *débris*, a circular area, round which ran a revetment of double slabs a few feet apart, with others laid across them, all just within the circuit wall of the citadel. This area nearly covers the six 'shaft-graves' in which and their contents the interest at Mycenæ mainly centres. But the fact that the angles of two of these stand out beyond the circle shows that they came first, and that the circle with its slabs was superimposed later. The natural face of the native rock in which the graves are hewn falls away westwards; and its slope was marked by a levelling of artificial soil deposited, with increasing depth of course in that direction, until it met the outer circuit wall.

In each grave, according to size and capacity varying from 9 feet by 10 to 16 feet by 22, from one to five corpses were deposited. The careful research and inquiry on the spot made by Dr. Dörpfeld has established: (1) that they were not filled and closed up at once with soil laid on top, but left surmounted with slabs merely, so as to allow *successive* interments; (2) that they seem to show progressive degrees of improved structure in the vaults and careful interment, as well as progressive gradations of art in their contents; (3) that the presumptions are against the cremation of the bodies, and that the ashes and traces of fire are probably those resulting from sacrificial offerings at the tombs; (4) that the vaults had in some cases side-walls built up, which supported transverse beams of wood, shod with copper at each end, and laid across the graves to support the slabs and earth above; (5) that the accumulation of earth and *débris* in some graves was caused by the eventual rotting of these transverse beams, which of course let down the earth &c. on top, together with the closing slabs, into the vault below; (6) that these graves, slabs, and their circular area cannot have been visible when, in the age of the Antonines, Pausanias visited the site and had pointed out to him certain tombs as containing the remains of Atreus and others of the Pelopid dynasty, or their dependants. He was further told that Ægisthus and Clytæmnestra

were buried apart outside the wall, and not allowed within the precinct sacred to that house of heroes.

It is a well-known fact that, while memorable names cling in local traditions to the general scenes of their stories, the particular monument, or building, or eminence, to which they attach themselves may not remain constant. Thus the late Mr. Fergusson showed that the reputed site of the Holy Sepulchre had changed in the course of ages, and that the 'Mount of Evil Counsel' is not the only summit near Jerusalem to which the tradition of the death of Judas has affixed itself.

Thus the particular *tumuli*, or bee-hive erections, if that was so, which Pausanias saw as the tombs of Agamemnon and others, may probably have done duty then as his and their memorials, merely because the demand of visitors' curiosity required some such satisfaction. But that of itself would not imply any serious credential of their genuineness. Whether, therefore, what he saw was what Dr. Schliemann excavated becomes a mere secondary question. Certainly six graves have been found within the circular area above mentioned, and Dr. Schliemann seems to assume (an assumption which his editor follows) that six are mentioned by Pausanias. This is not the case, and, the passage being defective through a *lacuna*, we are unable to judge whether he intended to speak of any precise number. His words are,* after noticing the 'fountain called Perseia' and 'the 'subterranean erections of Atreus and his sons,' that 'there is a tomb also of Atreus, and there are those of as many as Ægisthus slew at the banquet, on their return from Ilium with Agamemnon.' [Here obviously, unless all were interred in one tomb, several tombs might be intended.] 'About the monument (*μνῆμα*) of Cassandra, indeed, the Lacedæmonians of Amyclæ raise a question. But there is besides one (*ἕτερον*) of Agamemnon, and that of Eurymedon his charioteer, and one-and-the-same (*αὐτὸ*) belongs to Teledamus and Pelops—these were twins, they say, whom Cassandra bare—whom Ægisthus slew upon their parents, while yet infants.' [Here follows the *lacuna*.] 'For with Pylades she lived as wife, on Orestes giving her to him.' The *lacuna* referred, no doubt, to Electra, Agamemnon's daughter, but whether as buried at Mycenæ or elsewhere is wholly uncertain. Without, however, including her, we have here six tombs at least; and unless the slaughtered

* ii. 16, § 4.

comrades had *only one* among them, an uncertain larger number. Thus we cannot even reckon with any certainty on the number six as traditional. It is a remarkable confirmation of one point of that tradition that in the third grave, besides three full-grown women, there lay the bodies of two children, and that 'not only were the little faces covered with tiny masks of gold leaf, in one of which the eyes were cut out, while in both the forms were moulded by the hand over the face itself; but the hands and feet were likewise enveloped in gold leaf, which still shows clearly the shape of the fingers and toes' (p. 191).

The *stelai*, or upright slabs, found in the area above, and vertically over some of the graves, show, in the case of men, rudely sculptured scenes of war or hunting, but in that of women are plain and unadorned. But of all these accessory objects which stand on what was once the ground surface of the sepulchral area the most noteworthy is a singular altar in the form of a well-mouth, found vertically above the centre of grave No. 4, the largest, in which the remains of three males and two females were found. It is described as 'an almost circular mass of polygonal masonry,' with diameters of 7 feet and 5½ feet respectively, and a height of 4 feet (pp. 156-7, No. 112). Between its lower edge and the top of the grave was a depth of three feet, of slabs and soil. The object of this curious structure was, as believed, 'the *cultus* of the dead.' The blood of victims poured into the well-mouth would soak into the earth below, and this was all that would be required. Classical readers, who remember how, in the play of the 'Choëphoræ,' the tomb of Agamemnon forms the centre-piece of the scene, and how his royal shade, powerful in the realm of death, is wrought upon by the long psychagogic ode to succour his avengers, with the promise of libations added, will see how closely the well-mouth, exactly adapted to receive these latter, corresponds with the idea which governs the Æschylean drama.* As the destruction of Mycenæ took place eight or ten years after his death, the poet may easily in his earlier life have visited the spot, or have become otherwise familiar with the facts of the hero-worship there enacted. Its massive polygonal blocks mark the well-mouth as belonging to the highly archaic period, and, so long as it remained above the surface, it would doubtless be the most venerable of the monu-

* The very same tradition of this *cultus* of the dead Agamemnon, as surviving to the time of Euripides, is suggested by Eur. Or. 1225-42.

ments there exposed. It marked the communion of the living with the dead, and distinguished the one tomb which was found to be at once the amplest and the richest, and the only one in which the sexes, owing to some unusually close connexion between their respective members when alive, were found to be combined. It alone contained three of the famous gold masks and the magnificent sceptre above described, while the splendid finish of its women's diadems far exceeded those of the other female graves. With the two princesses, for so we must deem them, here entombed were also found two sumptuous golden rings, with intaglio devices, large golden hair-pins, and a gilded comb. It is noteworthy that the two women lay side by side with *one* of the men only, all three with their heads to the *east*, while the other two male corpses were placed apart in the southern part of the area, with their heads to the *north*. The same male corpse, facing eastward, had also near it a very heavy gold plate, decorated with a lion's head, at first supposed to be a face-mask, like the others, but determined, on closer inspection, to be the covering of a breastplate or shield. To the votaries of antique legend the supposition is therefore open still, that they have here the King of Men, with Cassandra and Electra, perhaps, laid beside him, while the two north-lying corpses may be those of Tisamenus (in whom, as stated above, the dynasty expired) and of some comrade, perhaps the charioteer Eurymedon.

We now pass on to class No. 4 of our Mycenaean evidences. The finds outside the graves betray a more advanced style of art than those within them. This is chiefly manifest on the seal devices, but is confirmed by the vases. These seals are the *intaglio* bezels of golden rings in both cases, but those from the graves have the forms exaggerated to a caricature distortion, while the lines are uncertain and the execution feeble (p. 221, Nos. 220, 221). The design and execution of the ring (p. 277, No. 281) are alike superior. It is from the treasure found *en masse* in what was probably the cellarage of an ancient dwelling-house, closely packed together, as though once contained in some perished chest. All the articles were those of use in real life. There were here no shavings or pellicles of gold, but all was solid. The shapes of the golden cups are more graceful in outline, and the handles, which terminate in dogs' heads, with jaws biting the rim, are of elegant curvature (p. 276, No. 280) as compared with the hard angular outline of those from the fourth grave (pp. 240, 241, 242, Nos. 289, 240, 241).

The vases, both in their colours, their decorations, and the quality of their clay, point also to a later period, and lie in time 'between the Mycenaean and the later style;' while the drawing 'most resembles the Melian vase-paintings, the 'precursors of the pure Greek manner of later ages' (p. 285). But probably a couple of centuries might measure the whole interval between the earliest of the shaft-graves and the latest object among these external finds.

A single sample of internal wall decoration, being a carved slab of porphyry, is shown (p. 285, No. 286). It was one of a series, forming a horizontal dado along the facing of masonry, all having the same pattern of an elongated rosette divided in two by a broad band which traverses it. Its special purpose 'remained a problem, till 'the excavations at Tiryns disclosed precisely the same 'system of ornamentation on the great alabaster frieze in 'the palace. Soon after, the buildings, to which alone the 'beautiful porphyry block could have belonged, were discovered at Mycenæ' (p. 286).

Here, again, in these internal decorations we are upon Homeric traces. 'Like the glitter of sun or moon' shone the interior palace walls of Menelaus and Alcinoüs.* The materials of splendour are, in the former, 'copper, gold, electrum, 'silver, and ivory;' in the latter, 'copper throughout,' and 'a cornice (or upper member) of *cyanus* running round.' The editor determines this *cyanus* to be 'small, a glass paste 'coloured blue with copper ore.' That is, he has found a decorative material of the Mycenaean wall-surfaces which yields that analysis. But this will never suit the many passages of Homer which determine *cyanus* (κύανος) certainly to be metallic, and probably to be bronze.†

But even more conspicuously Homeric in their wall decora-

* Od. iv. 45, 46; vii. 84, 85.

† If κύανος in Homer does not stand for 'bronze,' there is nothing that can, and the oldest composite metal, to which all museums testify as in primitive use, will be unrepresented in the oldest Greek poet. Next, κύανος must be a composite metal, for Hephaestus casts into his foundry four primary metals—gold, silver, copper, and tin; but among the products of the same is κύανος, a fifth. This points obviously to bronze. Familiar to us in the form of bell-metal, it is, though of variable hue, the darkest of known metals, and deepens this tint by exposure to the atmosphere. Thus it becomes a standard for dark hues generally, and its adjective, κύανεος, describes the black mourning garments of Thetis; or no darker dye for garments may have been known. (Il. xxiv. 93, 94.) That it must be a metal is proved

tion are the objects of class No. 6. The 'bee-hive tombs,' of which the so-called 'Treasury of Atreus' is the largest specimen, are now decided to be a later development of the older shaft-graves. They consist of a *θόλος*, or bee-hive chamber, built of horizontal rings of masonry which, narrowing, gradually approach each other, and of a much smaller nearly four-square side chamber, the actual sepulchre; whereas the *θόλος* is attributed to the *cultus* of the dead, which in the older shaft-grave was carried on, as we saw, from above. This later model gave easier access to both chambers, connected as they were by a doorway, and approached by a *δρόμος*, or long cutting, 115 feet long indeed in the 'Atreus' example, lined with slabs, and terminating in a stately façade and ample doorway, with large folding doors which revolved on pivots in lintel and threshold. Such arrangements were found in other temples at Menidi, in Attica, at Orchomenos, and near Volo in Thessaly, at Amyclæ, and elsewhere. The Menidi structure proved the sepulchral use of the side chamber, as many as six corpses, 'undisturbed, with all their ornaments about them,' being found within it. That at Orchomenus (the Bœotian, or, more exactly, the 'Minyeian') showed the link of connexion with the shaft-graves: its mortuary chamber being exactly such a shaft, sunk in the rock from above, not excavated sideways from the 'beehive,' which was later appended to it, and had also a *δρόμος*, or approach, of smaller dimensions. The Atreus bee-hive vault and the Orchomenian mortuary chamber are

not only by the fire-god's foundry, as above, but by its presence as an element of Agamemnon's cuirass, where it appears with gold and tin:

τοῦ δ' ἦτοι δέκα οἶμοι ἔσαν μέλαρος κῦάνοιο
 ὧδεκα δ' ἐ χρυσοῦ καὶ εἰκοσι κασσιτέραιο.

And again, amid the twenty bosses of tin on his shield the midmost is *μέλαρος κῦάνοιο*, besides the six *κῦάνοιο ὀράοντες* at the neck, and another, three-headed, on the baldric. (Il. xi. 24-7, 34, 35, 39, 40.) To suppose armour of 'glass paste' is absurd; and being, besides, distinctly here called *black*, it cannot be blue. Similarly, the foot of a table is shod with it, and the head of a galley is armed with it. That *κῦάνοιος* means 'blue' in post-Homeric Greek is certain; but the *κῦάνος* of Alcinoüs' palace must be different from all other Homeric *κῦάνος*, if it could mean the glass paste found by Dr. Schliemann among Mycenaean elements of wall decoration. Moreover, *κυανοχαίτης* is an epithet of Poseidon in Homer, as well as of a horse's mane, and the eyebrows of Zeus are *κῦάνειαι*. So is Hector's hair. Sand also is *ψάμμος κυανέη*. (Il. xi. 629; xv. 693; xx. 144, 224; xxii. 402; ii. 528; Od. xii. 243.)

best preserved, and we take them as typical, combining their features. The Mycenæan vault is 48 feet high, and with a base diameter nearly equal. The slab courses are massive at bottom, lightening upwards, and the three lower ones carried superb facings of alabaster or marble, to a height of probably some six feet; above which bronze rosettes or similar devices, large and small, thickly studded the curving walls, the stones of which had their edges finished in the smooth curve of those walls, thus simulating a perfect arch in every vertical section. The façade of the vault is 44 feet high—little short, that is, of the height of the building—with a doorway of nearly 17 feet high and over 8 feet wide, slightly narrowing upwards. It was coated with sumptuous marbles or bronze plates, the doorway having a casing of side-blocks with grooves sawn vertically on their surfaces to resemble successive vertical layers, and groups of grey or green alabaster columns at the jambs, thickening upwards, and carrying on their capitals probably a cornice of some richer stone; while the side-blocks supported enormous lintel-beams of massive stone, laid one behind the other in the depth of the doorway, the weight of one of which is computed at 120 tons. The design of the capitals has been restored by the draughtsman, and shows an Asiatic richness of form and decoration (p. 298, No. 289a), from which it is difficult to think that the severe simplicity of the Doric style was later deduced. Each doorway has over it a vacant triangular space in the solid masonry, similar to that over the 'Lions' Gate,' not to admit light, which is indeed excluded in one instance by thinner slabs of red porphyry, but merely to relieve the horizontal lintels of the superincumbent weight.

The greatest artistic marvel of the Orchomenian mortuary chamber was the ceiling of slate, at the height of 8 feet from the floor, richly diapered over its entire surface with a pattern, of which a spiral and a flower calyx with long pistil are the alternating elements, with bands of rosettes enclosing them in a square frame dentille-edged, and a minor repeating square in the interior of the larger one. As we retrace these features,

'we feel that the age was one not only of advanced *technique*, but capable of appreciating refined splendour in decoration, and, as we contemplate the enormous mass of the lintel, that great mechanical ability in quarrying and conveying stone must have been necessary to hew out such a block and bring it to the spot, and then to work it so accurately and lay it so carefully.' (P. 146.)

The Mycenæan beehive structures lie wholly in the lower city, which spreads out southwards and westwards of the citadel, and had its *enceinte* of wall, estimated at six feet only in thickness, of which too few remnants survive to determine its exact course. This city was limited by the two ravines of the two torrents before mentioned, which, of course, assisted its defences on the north and east, and, owing to the flexure of one of them, partly also on the west. We pass on briefly, under our last class of evidences, No. 7, to consider this site and 'the graves of the children of the 'people,' which remain where all else has perished. 'There 'can be no doubt that shaft-graves, palace, and lower city 'belong to one and the same great and connected period of 'civilisation' is the conclusion arrived at from a careful review of their contents, and that 'the developement to be 'traced from the shaft-graves to the palace and the graves 'of the lower city is unbroken and uniform.' The sepulchral chambers are disposed in groups, suggesting local distinctions of clanship, corresponding to those of the living society. Traces of sacrificial *cultus* are not wanting, while skeletons, as if of slaughtered slaves or captives, as exemplified at the pyre of Patroclus,* are found sometimes in the approaches or before the doors (pp. 296, 297; cf. 209, 210). The ruling clan lived in the citadel, and their chief burial-place lay accordingly within it. But as the six shaft-graves could contain some two or three generations only, they overflowed later into the bee-hive tombs below; and in the same lower city each clan had its sepulchral group in its own area.

Fresco painting is one of the oldest and most durable of the art forms of the world. Fragments of wall plaster found at Tiryns showed

'that the brush had sometimes entered into the lime, leaving the painted surface rough to this day, while the surrounding part is smooth. Only four colours are employed—white, yellow, red, and blue; green and all the half-tones are wanting. Their wealth of forms exhibits all the varied systems of Mycenæan ornamentation, and accordingly finds its analogies now in Mycenæ, now in Orchomenus, at times also in Menidi or in the islands.' (P. 119.)

The sample of wall painting from Tiryns on p. 118 bears close analogy to the roof of the Orchomenian sepulchre described above, having spiral volutes gracefully alternating with a leafage pattern and spike of foliage, as well as the rosetted border and dentillated edging. Blazing with metal

* Il. xxiii. 175.

and vivid with colour, as well as vigorous in delineation of pattern, such walls, whether they enclosed the revels of the living or sheltered the repose of the dead, were worthy of the heroic race to which song and tradition assign them.

The megalithic massiveness of Tiryns has enabled the structural nucleus of its chief members to weather the shocks of probably thirty centuries. The fortress walls vary from 16 to the enormous thickness of 57 feet, but are generally about 24 or 26 feet thick. Here, too, the resistance offered to time and earthquakes enables the remains to be interpretative of other sites, where, as at Mycenæ, the destroying hand of enemies had too completely effaced, or, as at Hissarlik, repeated rebuildings had too far confused, the primary lines, for their plan to be easily traceable. Every feature of the Homeric palace comes out clear. The μέγαρον or great hall of common life stood there, with its αἶθουσα or portico in front, and its πρόδομος or vestibule between the two. The prominence of the threshold, the large central hearth, the pillars in pairs sustaining the lofty roof (ὑψερεφὲς δῶμα), and the adjacent θάλαμοι or chambers for sleeping and storage, with bath-room, too, complete, are all there, while the approach to all lies through the spacious αὐλή or court-yard, with colonnaded sides, and the altar of Zeus Herkeios midmost. The very tool-marks of the workmen are there to tell the tale of their method, and show the predominance of the saw and the borer, or auger—a toothless saw, it seems, and a hollow tube of metal. Even the floor, which in the Odyssean palace seems to have been of native earth, was here of concrete, and had decorative lines and colours. The simple patterns of our older-fashioned floor-cloths, consisting of straight lines crossing each other in parallel sets, and enclosing equal squares and rectangles, must be among the most primitive in the world; for the sagacious antiquary retraces such on the palace pavement at Tiryns; and we read that ‘in the northern part of the hall there are still distinct traces of red colour on the larger central squares of the concrete. On the small strips separating these are faint traces of blue. Hence the floor was originally of a bright simple ‘carpet pattern.’ (Pp. 110, 111.)

The keen concentration of the learned and even the popular reader on the problem of Troy presented at Hissarlik, and the discussions which they evoked, absolve us from any close examination of the citadel and its treasures. One or two topographical points of high interest are, however, worth notice. As Dr. Schliemann rode down to bathe near Cape

Sigeum, his comrades, working in the plain at the foot of Hissarlik, noticed that he disappeared for a brief interval behind a swell of the ground, and presently re-emerged (p. 29). Thus was verified what Homer calls in *Il.* x. 160 the 'upthrow of the plain' (*θρῶσμός πεδίου*), which, before the levels were altered by the deposits of the river during some three thousand years, would have been more considerable than since. Further, the present mouth of the Scamander river lies so far to the west that the Greek host and their ships, crowding the beach between the Sigean and Rhatean promontories, would have been on the same eastern side as Troy itself—a position fatal to the Homeric conception of the battle-field. There is, however, evidence that the river has changed its course in the lapse of ages, that it flowed past Hissarlik, and had close beneath it a junction with the Simoeis, and an outflow to the sea considerably to the east of the present one, in the prehistoric time. Yet more, 'the actual springs of the Scamander, which are 'situated in the range of Ida, at the foot of the peak of 'Gargaros, have exactly the peculiarities which Homer 'describes'—of a hot and cold spring—but which he transfers to the spot close under the city, 'where the Trojan 'women came for water and washed their raiment.' This spot itself seems identified by 'a channel cut in the rock,' which at the end of 60 feet throws off three branches, with 'a good spring of drinking-water . . . at the end of each,' and a conduit of unbewn stones within the main channel. 'In 'Roman times an earthenware pipe leading to some partially 'preserved washing-troughs (*πλυνοί*) was laid above the 'conduit. This whole disposition of the site corresponds 'exactly with that presupposed in the *Iliad*' (pp. 29, 30).

The remains show a citadel of small extent, like the Acropoleis of Mycenæ, Tiryns, and Athens, containing only the palace of the rulers. At its foot lay the city of the people, which at Hissarlik has almost wholly vanished. But this citadel, strongly walled even at first, put on in its second period a panoply of gates and towers, and thus became the leading city of the whole of that Asia Minor coast. The buildings show a middle position between the three great civilisations of the ancient world, the Assyro-Babylonian, the Egyptian, and the Greek, and the inhabitants were in a state of transition from the two former to the latter manner. Agriculture and commerce united to mould their habits, but the influence of the latter freed them from traditional and ancestral uses to form a style of their own, and many of

their ornaments thus lack analogy elsewhere. In this their imperial period Asiatic wealth and culture, crossing the *Ægean*, had fecundated the old Pelasgic races with the elements of a rival empire on its western shore; hence ensued jealousy and collision, the tale of which, charming all ages since, has remained an enigma to the historian until unriddled by Schliemann's adventurous spade.

Our last traces of the illustrious discoverer's footprints shall be in Ithaca, where he had, in nautical language, 'boxed' the Homeric 'compass,' terminating there in the south-west, as he had begun at Hissarlik on the north-east. His chief Ithacan researches were topographical. He sought to identify the city and palace of Odysseus with some undoubtedly highly ancient walls of 'Cyclopean' character on Mount Aëtos, enclosing a small rocky plateau on the conical summit, and circumvallating lower down a larger zone of the mountain. The objection to this is, that 'there was no room between the blocks on the narrow plateau for a palace even of the very smallest dimensions, nor for a town on the steep declivities of the rock.'

A further objection, to judge from the maps and the description, would be the absence of any spring or well, and the distance of any fresh water in sufficient abundance. It is plain, moreover, that the town and palace of Odysseus in the poem were out of sight from the head of the harbour, as otherwise they must have been noticed in the panorama shown him by Athene, in *Od.* xiii. 344 foll. That harbour is certainly either the larger gulf of Molo, or one of its smaller offsets, Vathy and Dexia. Dr. Schliemann preferred the latter, since there the features more closely correspond with those described in the landing of Odysseus by the Phæacians. But the cone of Aëtos, 650 feet above sea level, must seemingly be conspicuous from either of these. Further, the 'island of Asteris,' where the Suitors lay their ambushade for Telemachus, appears identified with the hummock Daskalion, lying towards Zante near the north-western corner of Ithaca, and wholly outside the run of Telemachus in his return from Western Peloponnesus. But assuming the ancient ruins, to which cleave still the names of Polis and Kastro, near that north-western extremity, to represent the capital, all the needful conditions seem to be met. The 'cave of the Nymphs,' with its mythical features of their 'bowls and jars,' and 'stony looms whereon they weave raiment of purple hue, a marvel to be seen,' is found, equidistant from the above-named

inlets, in a stalactited cavern, replete with such fantastic forms as those of our Cheddar cave in the Mendips, easily lending themselves to the simple nature-worship of the Naiads, whose spring rises within the rocky vault, and where a rude ancient altar testifies to their cult. Dr. Schliemann noticed that its entrances were, one precipitous, the other accessible by rude rocky stairs; which fact exactly fits the Homeric approaches for the immortals and for mortal men respectively.* The 'Raven' (κόραξ) rock and the 'Arethusa' spring† are found in actual features of landscape a little to the east, near which the lodge of Eumæus, the loyal swineherd, may be well located; and hard by is a precipitous rock,‡ exactly fitting the challenge of the disguised Odysseus to his devoted but desponding henchman—to fling him down from its summit if his tidings proved not true. Thus every feature of the Homeric Ithaca, on the details of which turns the entire mechanism of the last half of the Odyssey, is vindicated and verified. As when the goddess rolled away the mist from her hero's eyes and made him know his native landscape,§ so before research the mist of ages vanishes, the topography shines out again, and its 'very stones prate of his whereabouts.'

Surely a happy life must Schliemann's have been, when he once emerged from the scanty and poverty-stricken surroundings of his earlier days.

Haud facile emergunt, quorum virtutibus obstat
Res angusta domi.

But by a combination of enthusiasm, perseverance, and skill, he lived to win every trick on fortune's board in the game on which he staked his venture. He, comparatively quickly, realised a large commercial fortune, and made it only a means to an end—the further realising the vision cherished from his too brief schoolboy days. He won, yet more, that highest life-prize—a loving and devoted wife, who shared his diggers' camp, where, in 1873, 'of an evening we 'had nothing to keep us warm except our enthusiasm for 'the great work of discovering Troy,' as they sat in the 'thin wooden shed,' with the water freezing at the fire-

* Ithaque, p. 21. Od. xiii. 103-12.

† Od. xiii. 408.

‡ Probably the Κόρακος πέτρη itself. See Od. xiv. 399.

§ Ibid. xiii. 352.

side, shivering in Homer's wind 'blowing up from the Hellespont.'

Βορρῆς καὶ Ζέφυρος, τῷ τε Θρήνηθεν ἄητον,

and who has her own special monument in the beehive tomb opened at Mycenæ under her own direction (p. 148, No. 140), and in the volume dedicated to her by him, containing the first record of their joint labours there, as 'une faible preuve de mon admiration pour ses études homériques, de ma reconnaissance pour son dévouement et son zèle, et pour l'énergie avec laquelle elle a su soutenir mon courage dans les temps de nos rudes épreuves.'

Thus the biographical sketch prefixed is as interesting as any part of the volume. The subject of it swims on the elation of struggle and victory, through efforts borne up by a firm faith and buoyant hope, towards an ever widening horizon of assurance, success, and fame. He digs up, so to speak, first himself, then his fortune; then Troy, then Greece. He was on the eve of another spade-campaign—was just sounding to his followers the signal for advance, when his own signal sounded for recall from this world, which he had done so much to enrich and beautify with the large lessons of its own long forgotten history embedded in its oldest and noblest poetry. Every museum in Europe is probably more or less his monument. Dazzled by the success, brilliant as that of Aladdin in the cavern, which waited early on his spade; blinded, perhaps, for the moment by the 'Wonderful Lamp' which he had unearthed, he hazarded some early guesses, the errors of which are now of no more account than a pressman's errors in the first rough proof-sheet pulled off. Of course, the claim to have dug up Priam's treasure and Helen's toiletry, and 'the King of Men' himself with weapons and sceptre complete, set the bristles of criticism on end, and our own universities were chary of recognising the achievement for fear of being committed to the theories. The late memorable librarian of Bodley's intimated the qualms felt at Oxford in his playful way to the present writer. It was as though the 'potent, grave, and reverend signiors' of the 'Hebdomadal' feared to 'be translated,' like Bottom, into images of the owl-headed Pallas or the bucephalous Here. It was in fact only in 1883, seven years after Schliemann's success at Mycenæ, and ten after his success at Hissarlik, that Oxford enrolled him a D.C.L. and Queen's College therein elected him an honorary fellow.

The motive which led him through commerce to letters and antiques was a supreme belief in the truth of Homer, under the fascination of whose genius and language he fell, through some inscrutable affinity of mind, before he could read a line of Greek or knew any but his native tongue. Throughout his mercantile career he continued adding to his linguistic stores, until he had mastered an unusually large group of European languages, including Greek, ancient and modern. Thus he came equipped materially and mentally to the *negotium in otio* of his life. Upon this ideal, the verification of Homer, he concentrated all his many natural and acquired gifts, while the enthusiasm of his faith placed in his hands that divining rod for the hidden treasure of the olden world which was the crowning gift of all. If Homer had never sung, Schliemann would never have delved.*

* Whilst these sheets are passing through the press our attention, has been called to an interesting volume by Miss Agnes M. Clerke entitled 'Familiar Studies in Homer,' in which the accomplished authoress follows, in a popular and attractive form, the same line of argument with reference to Mycenaean art and its influence on Homer which is presented in the foregoing article. Dr. Murray's 'Handbook of Greek Archaeology' and Professor Mahaffy's 'Problems of Greek History' are also largely based on Dr. Schliemann's latest discoveries.

ART. VI.- 1. *Mémoires du Général Baron de Marbot.*
Tome III. Paris: 1891.

2. *The Memoirs of Baron de Marbot, late Lieutenant-General in the French Army.* Translated from the French by ARTHUR JOHN BUTLER, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: 1892.

WE return to General Marbot's delightful Memoirs, the first parts of which we lately reviewed, and shall briefly examine the concluding part. Meanwhile we learn with pleasure that an English translation of the work, slightly abridged, has been published by Mr. Arthur Butler, which cannot fail to obtain a very wide circulation in this country, for it is a most captivating, romantic, and, we believe, authentic record of the military glory and reverses of France. The author describes in the volume before us the decline and fall of Napoleon's Empire, and the memorable events connected with it, with the intelligence and in the vivid language which give so great a charm to his first volumes; and his narrative is of real historical value as regards the scenes he witnessed himself. General Marbot gives us important details respecting the invasion of 1812, the appalling destruction of the Grand Army, the efforts made by Napoleon to restore his power, and the gigantic contest that ended at Leipzig, which have not been placed in such clear relief before; and a short letter from his pen throws considerable light on one debated passage in the campaign of Waterloo. His sketches, too, of the leading soldiers of the Empire are exceedingly graphic; like that of Masséna, already referred to in our article on his first volumes, those of Oudinot, St.-Cyr, Macdonald, and Berthier are admirable for their clearness and skill; and he is by no means blind to Napoleon's faults, which he sets forth with much force and insight, though he was true to the last to his great master. Yet in this, as in the other parts of the work, what is most interesting, and perhaps most instructive, is the portrait the author draws of himself; he was the very ideal of a French officer of the highest type, in the days of the Empire; intelligent, skilful, full of resource, brave to a fault, and despising perils, but also overflowing with self-esteem, as contemptuous of the humbled allies who followed in the wake of the Grand Army as the Legions were of their mere auxiliaries, and rendered utterly callous by long experience, not only to all the horrors of

war, but to the excesses and cruelties which marked its course from 1792 to 1815.

We left Marbot returning to France, after Fuentes d'Onoro, with Masséna in disgrace. He married at the close of 1811, and was made happy by a good wife, of whom, however, he tells us nothing, in this following a wise saw of Pericles, and not, as he thinks, of a French philosopher. He remained for a short time on Masséna's staff; and the anecdotes he relates about the marshal are interesting and, in some respects, important. Masséna had been a smuggler in youth; and the knowledge he had acquired of the Genoese seaboard, and especially of the passes through the hills beyond, stood Napoleon in good stead in 1796. The following shows the agility and resource of one who had been a leader in contraband before he became a leader in war:—

It became apparent that a battalion, placed the evening before on an isolated hill, could not come down, by any practicable way, without making a long circuitous march and exposed to the fire of the enemy. Masséna, working up the ascent on his knees and hands, makes for this battalion, reaches it, harangues the men, and assures them that, if they will imitate him, they will get out of the scrape. He makes them sheathe their bayonets, sits down on the snow at the edge of the slope, and, pushing himself forward with his hands, slides down to the bottom. All our soldiers, laughing in fits, do the same; and in the twinkling of an eye the whole battalion was formed and far beyond the reach of the dumbfounded Austrians! This way of getting down a hill, which is very like what peasants and guides in Switzerland call *la ramasse*, had certainly never been attempted before by soldiers. Extraordinary as it may appear, the fact is true; it was certified to me by Generals Roguet père, Soules, Albert, and other officers in Masséna's division at the time; and, nine years afterwards, being at La Houssaye, when Marshal Augereau received the Emperor and the other marshals, I heard them jesting with Masséna about this singular method of retreat.

Masséna had one master vice, avarice; and this, more than once, almost marred his career. It prevented Napoleon from asking him to go to Egypt; and his disgraceful exactions were the real cause that, notwithstanding his grand defence of Genoa, he was not given the chief command in Italy, after Marengo. Napoleon tried to cure an old companion in arms of a moral disease which had become too bad even for the plunderers of the Grand Army; but it was all in vain that he made the Marshal the wealthiest of his great dignitaries. The dog returned to his vomit again; and Masséna amassed a fortune in selling licences, and frustrating the Continental System, when placed in the highest command to support it. Napoleon made him disgorge some of his ill-gotten gains.

'The Emperor, having been informed that Masséna had deposited a sum of 3,000,000 francs at a banker's in Leghorn, who, at the same time, had received 600,000 from General Solignac, wrote to the marshal for a loan of a million francs, and asked for 200,000 from the chief of his staff. This was exactly a third of what each had made by licences. The Emperor, you see, did not skin them much. But at the sight of this new kind of draft on him, Masséna, savage as a lion whose vitals were being torn out, replied to Napoleon that he was the poorest of his marshals, that he was burdened by a large family and half ruined with debts; and that he was very sorry he could send nothing. General Solignac made a similar answer; and both were delighted at having tricked the Emperor. But during the siege of Gaeta, the son of the banker at Leghorn came as a courier, and announced that the inspector of the treasury, attended by a commissioner of police and by several gendarmes, had presented themselves to his father, and had taken possession of the cashbook, in which he had acknowledged the receipt of the 3,600,000 francs deposited by the marshal and General Solignac, adding that this sum belonged to the army, had been entrusted to these two personages, and must forthwith be made good by them.'

Masséna, however, was only the worst of the military chiefs who had been trained to rapine by the revolutionary and Napoleonic system of war. We commend to our readers the following anecdote. Soult, a Jew like Masséna, had, as every one knows, a magnificent collection of paintings, stolen from religious houses in Andalusia; and naïvely asked the late Lord Cowley 'if his uncle, the duke, had not a gallery 'of the kind.' 'Non, M. le Maréchal, *il vous a suivi*,' was the witty reply.

The rumours of an impending conflict with Russia had filled Paris in the winter of 1811; and Napoleon, in fact, had been preparing that gigantic enterprise for nearly a year before. We need hardly refer to what has been alleged by Marbot as a principal cause of the final rupture—the ascendancy of the party which had murdered Paul, for his French sympathies, in Alexander's councils; the causes were more profound and lasting. The alliance of Tilsit had been hollow from the first; it had not satisfied the ambition of the Czar; and the injury done to Russia by the Continental System, the creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and the continual extension of the French Empire, precipitated a quarrel which must have occurred. Marbot asserts that Napoleon was implored by experienced officers, who knew Russia well, not to commit France to the fatal mission; but his correspondence proves that he soon made up his mind, and that he was confident he would 'devour all obstacles.' The

without fighting. I had the happiness to regain my bivouac without having to regret the death, or even the wounding, of one of my men.'

On another occasion he took a prominent part in a pre-concerted attack on a Russian detachment, the general of which, Koulnieff, an habitual drunkard, had placed his camp close to a stream on his rear. The Russians were overthrown and their leader was slain; the 23rd captured fourteen guns in one charge, and Napoleon gave the corps fourteen decorations for a feat of arms of singular daring and skill.

'Koulnieff, scarcely awake, joined a group of 2,000 men, of whom a third at most had muskets, and, mechanically following this disordered mass, reached the ford. But, after getting into his camp, I had caused this important point to be occupied by 500 or 600 troopers containing the *compagnie d'élite*; and these, exasperated at the fate of their captain, charged the Russians furiously, and slew many of them. General Koulnieff, already staggering from the effects of drunkenness, on horseback attacked Legendre, a *maréchal des logis*. Legendre thrust his sabre into his throat, and stretched him dead at his feet. . . . The victory of General Albert and of the 23rd was complete. The enemies lost at least 2,000 men, killed or wounded, and we made nearly 4,000 prisoners. The rest perished on the steep rocks where they fell.'

The contest between Wittgenstein and Oudinot was not attended with great results; but Oudinot, on the whole, was worsted. Napoleon sent St.-Cyr with a Bavarian detachment to the assistance of the perplexed marshal, being dissatisfied, no doubt, with Oudinot's conduct. St.-Cyr was a very different chief from the superior of whom he was to be the master; he belonged to the old army of the Sambre and Meuse, and to the class of the Klebers and the Desaixs; he had been one of the best of Moreau's lieutenants, and he had real capacity and great military gifts. But he had, in a very high degree, one of the besetting sins of the warriors of France—want of loyalty to his colleagues in the field; he was also jealous, irritable, selfish, peevish, and indifferent to the needs of his soldiers, and he was disliked by all the governments he served in his career. Marbot gives us this account of this remarkable man:—

'In fact, St.-Cyr was one of the most capable soldiers in Europe. . . . You could not see a man of more calmness of mind. The greatest dangers, difficulties, success, defeat, nothing could move him. He was ice in the face of all events. One can understand what advantages a character like this, improved, too, by study and reflection, gave this general officer. But St.-Cyr, too, had serious faults; jealous of his comrades, he has often been seen to keep his troops out of action while other divisions hard by were being crushed. St.-Cyr would then advance, and, turning to account the fatigue of the enemy, would beat

them, and seem to have won the victory himself. Again, if St.-Cyr was one of the chiefs of the army who best knew how to handle troops in the field of battle, he was certainly more indifferent than any to their welfare.'

Oudinot was on the Upper Dwina, near Polotsk, when St.-Cyr joined the corps of the marshal. A bloody and indecisive battle followed, and Oudinot withdrew a part of his guns across the river with precipitate haste—a move which shook the courage of the French soldiery. Napoleon had reckoned without his host if he thought that St.-Cyr would give a colleague help at a pinch of this kind.

'During these bloody marchings to and fro, what was General St.-Cyr doing? He followed Oudinot in silence, and when the marshal asked his advice, bowed low, and simply said, "Monseigneur le Maréchal!" That was as much as to say, "Since you have been made a marshal, you ought to know more than I do. I am a mere general; get out of the mess as well as you can."'

Oudinot, perhaps fortunately, was wounded at Polotsk, and handed over the command to St.-Cyr. The presence of a superior mind was at once seen in the operations of the French, and St.-Cyr gained a very brilliant victory—a feat of arms which brought him a marshal's staff, though he was not unreasonably disliked by Napoleon. St.-Cyr was not slow in exhibiting his characteristic faults as a military chief.

'Anyone but St.-Cyr would, after so rude a conflict, have reviewed his troops, in order to congratulate them on their courage, and to ask what they were in need of; but it was not so. The last shot had hardly been fired before St.-Cyr shut himself up in the Jesuit convent, and spent all his days and part of his nights in doing what—in playing the fiddle, his ruling passion. . . . When informed of the victory won by St.-Cyr at Polotsk, the Emperor sent him the bâton of Marshal of the Empire. But, instead of taking this opportunity to visit his troops, the new marshal lived in greater seclusion than ever, if that were possible. No one could get access to the chief of the army, so the soldiers gave him the nickname of the owl.'

St.-Cyr was left in command of two corps to cover the centre of the Grand Army. Napoleon, meantime, had endeavoured in vain to reach and separate the Russian armies, and, after a long and fruitless march from Witebsk, he arrived at Smolensk in the middle of August. He was at the portals of Old Muscovy, and he tried to force Barclay and Bagration, by this time uniting, to stand and fight a decisive battle. Barclay, however, fell back, and the Grand Army only entered Smolensk to find charred ruins and thousands slain after a furious assault.

'It was only the next day that the French entered the city; the

streets were strewn with Russian corpses and smoking remains of houses. The capture of Smolensk had cost us 12,000 men killed and wounded—an enormous loss which we might have avoided had we passed the Dnieper higher up the river, as General Eblé had advised.'

The French had another chance to destroy the Russians at Valoutina, not far from Smolensk. But Junot, another of Napoleon's favourites, was as incapable as Jérôme had been:—

'The battle would have been fatal to the enemy if General Junot . . . had marched at the sound of the guns of Ney, not more than a league distant. But, though warned by Ney, Junot would not stir a step.'

The Grand Army was in the depths of Russia, and though no great battle had yet been fought, it had lost more than a third of its numbers, so appalling had been the result of a march, without proper supplies, through a ravaged country. The Emperor, however, pressed forward; Moscow was distant less than two hundred miles; peace, he was convinced, would there be found; and he looked forward to another Friedland and Tilsit. Fortune, too, smiled treacherously on her favourite; his position seemed, for the time, secure; and he took precautions to guard his flanks and his rear, which, in his trust in his allies, appeared perfect. He set off from Smolensk in the last week of August, at the head of about 160,000 men, the flower and strength of the Grand Army; and the armed masses, which had received supplies, as it was known that the country on their way had been ruined, moved for a time in order along the vast watershed of the streams which fall into the Black Sea and the Baltic. By degrees, however, disbanding, disease, and straggling began, and caused immense losses, as provisions fell short, and disappeared; and the army heard at last with delight that Kutusoff and the forces of the Czar were standing at Borodino to accept battle. We shall pass rapidly over the events that followed, for Marbot knew them by hearsay only; he had remained, on the Dwina, under the command of St.-Cyr. Borodino was only a greater Eylau; and though the French certainly gained the day, Kutusoff saved nearly two-thirds of his army, and this was largely recruited as he fell back towards Kalouga. Napoleon entered Moscow on the 14th of September; and in a few hours the hurricane of flame in which the perishing city was engulfed attested the noble patriotism of a nation resolved to defend its independence to the death. The Emperor, however, believed that peace was at hand; the example of Spain had taught him nothing; the idea that Russia would fight to the last seemed idle; and he let weeks slip by in the vain hope that

the Czar would treat, as he had treated at Tilsit. It is probable, too, that Kutusoff deceived the conqueror, and led him on in his fatal delusion.

'Napoleon had not abandoned the hopes of making peace. On the 4th of October he sent his aide-de-camp, General Lauriston, to the headquarters of Marshal Kutusoff. The cunning Russian showed General Lauriston a letter, written by him to the Emperor Alexander, urging him to accept the proposals of the French, seeing that it declared the Muscovite army could not keep the field any longer, such was its plight. But hardly had the officer who carried this despatch taken his departure for St. Petersburg—he had been furnished by Lauriston with a passport to protect him from our partisans, who wandered about between the two armies—when Kutusoff sent another aide-de-camp to his master. This second messenger, being without a pass, was met by our patrols, and as he was good prize, according to the laws of war, he was arrested, and his despatches sent to Napoleon. They contained exactly the opposite of that which Kutusoff had showed Lauriston. In fact, the Russian marshal, after entreating his sovereign not to deal with the French, told him "that the army of Admiral Tchitchakoff, having left Wallachia after the peace with the Turks, was advancing to Minsk to cut off Napoleon's retreat." Kutusoff also informed Alexander of the negotiations he had begun and was adroitly carrying on with Murat in order to maintain the pernicious policy of security entertained by the French, as they stayed at Moscow at such an advanced season of the year.'

The famous retreat began on the 19th of October, three weeks, at the very least, too late. We shall not retrace the scenes of that appalling tragedy until Marbot ere long became involved in them. Napoleon attempted to reach Kalouga in the hope of living on an unravaged country; but he had recoiled from Malo-Jaroslavetz; and he was forced back on the wasted line of march on which he had advanced to Moscow. Famine and winter fell on the perishing host; and the army, 100,000 strong when it left Moscow, was a mere horde of 40,000 fugitives when, after a few days, it reached Smolensk. It found no refuge at this expected haven; the intelligence that enemies were gathering on his rear compelled Napoleon to break up from Smolensk; and, after wasting and sacking the magazines, which had been collected to supply its wants, the wreck of the army, in part reinforced, toiled feebly through the forests and icy steppes which unite the Upper Dwina and the Upper Dnieper. Men and horses sank down and died in thousands; Kutusoff hung on the flanks of the despairing multitudes, cutting off stragglers and capturing prisoners; and the French army must have been utterly destroyed had he shown more determination and skill. The heroism of Ney shed a ray of glory

on the horrors of this part of the retreat; the means by which he contrived to lead the remains of his corps across the Dnieper and to rejoin the Emperor have not, perhaps, been fully described before.

‘A Russian colonel, coming from Krasnoi, introduces himself as a flag of truce, and calls on Ney to lay down his arms. The marshal breaks out into indignation at the thought of such an affront; and as the enemy’s officer had no written order, Ney declares that he will treat him as a spy, not as the bearer of a flag of truce, and that he will have him bayoneted, if he does not guide him to the nearest point of the Dnieper. The colonel was forced to obey. Thereupon Ney gives orders for leaving the camp in silence; he leaves behind guns, caissons, baggage, and the wounded unable to follow him; and then, favoured by the darkness, he reaches the Dnieper, after a march of four hours. The river was frozen, but not so completely as to be passable at all points; there were many crevices, and the ice was so thin at some spots that it broke if many men passed at the same time. The marshal made his soldiers cross one after the other.’

During the advance of the Grand Army on Moscow, St.-Cyr made a great entrenched camp near Polotsk, and had held Wittgenstein effectually in check. In this breathing time of nearly two months Marbot gave proof of remarkable powers of organisation and sagacious forethought. He had been severely wounded at the beginning of the campaign; but he scorned to abandon the regiment he led; and it was well for the 23rd that he remained its chief. He took extraordinary care of his men; provided them with sheepskins to face the winter; scoured the country to obtain supplies of food, of brandy, of cattle, of flour, of corn; and sent off his dismounted troopers to Warsaw, not to depôts in the immediate rear—a precaution that saved hundreds of valuable lives. The results of this admirable conduct deserve special notice; the 23rd numbered 1,000 sabres when it crossed the Niemen in the summer of 1812, and it was still nearly 700 strong after the campaign had ended. Napoleon properly thought that this striking contrast to the ruin of nearly every corps which had taken part in the great invasion was worthy of no ordinary praise.

‘The Emperor ordered Prince Berthier to express to us the satisfaction of his Majesty on account of the pains we had taken in preserving our men and our horses. The Emperor was aware that the 23rd Chasseurs had not gone to Moscow, and did not compare its losses with those of regiments who had been there; but he did make a comparison in respect of the losses of the 2nd Corps d’Armée, for these regiments had been under the same conditions, and ought to have suffered almost equally. Nevertheless, the 23rd Chasseurs, though it had been more

under the fire of the enemy than the others, had brought home more men than any, and his Majesty attributed this to the zeal of the colonel, the officers, and sous-officers, and to the good conduct of the men.'

Marbot dwells with pride on the intelligent skill of the French soldiery in establishing themselves on the Dwina, and drawing supplies from the country, and mocks at the inferiority, in this respect, of the Bavarian allies. The Frenchman probably has more aptitude for war, and more resource, than his German rival; but the French troops at that time were trained to rapine; the German auxiliaries were novices only.

'The Bavarians did nothing to avert misery and disease. It was in vain that General Count Wrede tried to stir them up, showing with what zeal the French soldiers made barracks, cut and ground the corn, changed it into flour, built ovens, and baked bread. The unhappy Bavarians, utterly demoralised since they no longer received regular distributions, admired the intelligent work of our troops, but would not imitate it. They died like flies.'

Wittgenstein, having been largely reinforced, attacked St.-Cyr, in the third week of October, and endeavoured to force him away from the Dwina; this being a part of the great movement of the Russian armies, to close on the rear of Napoleon as he fell back from Moscow. The Russian commander, however, accomplished little; he took the entrenched camp, but was beaten by St.-Cyr, with inferior forces, in several combats; and he fell for a moment into the enemy's hands. But, just at this crisis, the worst faults of the character of St.-Cyr were made manifest, with evil results to the army he led. Victor had been despatched in haste by Napoleon to assist St.-Cyr and to throw Wittgenstein back; but St.-Cyr would not serve under Victor, and making the pretence of a wound he left his troops. Marbot asserts that Victor, one of the worst of the marshals, lost a great opportunity to defeat Wittgenstein.

'Marshal Victor had scarcely united the 2nd and 7th corps under his command when fortune gave him the means of winning a brilliant victory. Wittgenstein, unaware of this junction, and relying on his superiority of numbers, attacked our outposts, having imprudently left very difficult defiles close to his rear. All that was required was a well-executed effort made by the two corps to destroy him, for our troops, now as numerous as his, were animated by the best spirit, and were eager to fight. Victor, however, no doubt mistrusting himself upon a terrain which he beheld for the first time, took advantage of the night and retreated.'

The general result of these operations was that, though suffering immense losses, Wittgenstein gradually threw back

the left wing of the Grand Army, and drew near the line of Napoleon's retreat from Smolensk. Meantime, on the opposite side of the immense theatre of war, Tchitchakoff had repelled the right wing, passing Schwartzenberg and the Austrian army, and thus, while Kutusoff was following the broken horde from Moscow, two Russian armies were pressing forward to intercept the French on the Beresina and to effect their complete destruction. Marbot, like most French writers, denounces the conduct of Schwartzenberg as 'the blackest treason,' and we can readily believe that the Austrian chief was not too eager to defeat Tchitchakoff. But Schwartzenberg was a timid commander; his army was already in a bad plight, and, in any case, he made no greater mistake than Jérôme and Junot made in the advance on Moscow. It is fair, however, to let Marbot make his charge.

'The situation of the French army became daily worse. Field-Marshal Schwartzenberg, who commanded in chief the Austrian corps which Napoleon had made the right wing of the army, had, through the most infamous treachery, allowed the Russians of Tchitchakoff to pass before his front.' These had seized Minsk, and from that place threatened our rear.'

It was now not far from the end of November, and Napoleon was making his way from Smolensk, with the miserable remains of the Grand Army, followed by Kutusoff and his swarms of Cossacks. The Emperor was aware that enemies had gathered on his rear, but he seems not to have known that Tchitchakoff was near the Beresina, and barring his retreat, and that Wittgenstein was at no great distance. Under this false impression he burned his pontoons, in order to make the retreat more rapid—an act that nearly led to his complete ruin.

'The Emperor calculated on passing the Beresina at Borisoff, the bridge of which was protected by a fortress in a good state and by a Polish regiment. Napoleon's confidence was so extreme that, in order to lighten the march of his army, he caused all his bridging equipages to be burnt at Orscha. It was a great misfortune, for these pontoons would have assured us an easy passage across the Beresina, which we obtained at the price of so much blood.'

Meanwhile, Oudinot, who had replaced St.-Cyr, and Victor were drawing towards the Emperor, and endeavouring to protect his line of retreat. The Russians were near the Beresina, and Oudinot, who had repulsed an attack of Tchitchakoff, hastened to seize the bridge of Borisoff, the only passage across the river, and just surrendered. Marbot

fell on, being in the front ; but he was too late, and the bridge was destroyed.

'The defeat of the Russian advanced guard had terrified the army of Tchitchakoff; the greatest disorder prevailed on the bank it occupied, and we saw masses of fugitives run away over the country. I began to hope for a good result, though it seemed to me at first that it would be very difficult for dismounted horsemen, without bayonets, to force the passage of a bridge, and to hold their ground; for the enemy showed a few sharpshooters only. I ordered the platoons who were first to reach the right bank to seize the houses next to the bridge, so that, holding both extremities, we could defend it until the arrival of our infantry, and so secure for the French army a way across the Beresina. But all of a sudden the guns of the fortress open, and cover the platform of the bridge with a discharge of grape-shot, which carries disorder into our feeble battalion, and compels it, for a moment, to fall back. A body of Russian sappers, furnished with torches, seizes the opportunity and sets the bridge on fire; but, as the presence of the sappers stopped the artillery of the enemy, we charged. Most of the sappers were slain or thrown into the river; some chasseurs had already extinguished the fire, which had only just begun to burn, when a battalion of grenadiers, rushing up at quick step, compels us, at the bayonet's point, to abandon the bridge. This was soon covered with lit torches, and became a huge conflagration, the intense heat of which drove the combatants away.'

The retreat of Napoleon was now cut off; Tchitchakoff held the Beresina in his front; Wittgenstein, on the right, was close to the stream, and Kutusoff was still hanging on his rear. Mack and Melas were never in so woful a plight; and Macmahon was certainly in less danger when, on the 31st of August, 1870, he lay paralysed around Sedan. In this terrible situation the French army was saved, partly through the resource of the Emperor, partly through the mistakes of the Russian commanders, who, Wellington truly said, ought to have destroyed their enemy. Marbot gives us valuable details about these operations, which have not, we think, seen the light before. An accident seems to have revealed the existence of the ford at Studianka, which enabled the French to effect the passage, though with enormous loss.

'The bold march made by Corbineau was glorious for him and fortunate in the extreme for the army; for the Emperor, having ascertained that it was physically impossible to restore speedily the bridge at Borisoff, resolved, after a conversation with Corbineau, to cross the Beresina at Studianka.'

Napoleon had not been equal to himself during the appalling scenes of the retreat from Moscow; but he seized his one chance with characteristic skill. He made demonstrations as if he was about to cross the river below Borisoff;

and, in order more effectually to deceive the enemy, he sent masses of fugitives in that direction ; but, meanwhile, he got everything ready to pass at Studianka. Tchitchakoff fell stupidly into the snare, and left open the point which he ought to have closed.

‘ Tchitchakoff, informed of these preparations, and having no doubt that the intention of Napoleon was to cross the river at the spot referred to, and to gain the road to Minsk, which was at hand, made haste to send along the right bank, not only all the garrison of Borisoff, in front of Oukoloda, but also, with a want of insight which can hardly be estimated, this general, who was in sufficient force to guard at the same time the lower and upper parts of the stream, caused all the troops placed the day before above Borisoff and the Beresina to descend on Oukoloda.’

The faults of Tchitchakoff, however, did not end here ; he did not destroy a succession of bridges leading from Studianka, across the marshes of the Beresina, on the way to Zembin ; had he done this, the mere passage would have been useless.

‘ Tchitchakoff made another mistake which a sergeant would not have made, and which his government never forgave him. Zembin is built upon a great marsh traversed by the road to Wilna by Kamen. The chaussée contains twenty-two wooden bridges, which the Russian general could have reduced to ashes before he set off, for they were surrounded by a great number of ricks of dry rushes. Had Tchitchakoff taken this sensible precaution, the French army would have been irretrievably lost, and it would have gained nothing by crossing the river.’

Meanwhile, Eblé and the French engineers had done wonders in throwing two bridges at Studianka across the half-frozen stream. The attitude of the Emperor and of Murat, essentially a fair-weather soldier, is thus graphically sketched by Marbot :—

‘ The Emperor walked fast, went from one regiment to another, and spoke to soldiers and officers alike. Murat was with him. This brave and daring warrior, who had performed such fine feats of arms while the victorious French were advancing on Moscow, Murat, the proud Murat, had been as it were in eclipse since he had left that city, and during the retreat he had taken part in no engagement.’

On this occasion Marbot saw for the first time the hideous remains of the Grand Army.

‘ My spirit sank and was grieved. Every grade was confounded ; no arms, no military bearing ! Soldiers, officers, and even generals, covered with rags, their only hose being scraps of leather or of cloth scarcely held together by twine ! A huge chaos, composed of thou-

sands of men of different races, jabbering all the tongues of the European Continent, and unable to understand each other !'

The Russian commanders had been inactive while Napoleon had been securing the passage. At last Tchitchakoff, having found out his mistake, marched to attack the French army near the bridges, but he was repulsed by Oudinot with heavy loss. Kutusoff and Wittgenstein fell on Victor; one division was cut off, and laid down its arms: but the marshal succeeded in crossing the river. The French had escaped, though cruelly stricken, and care had not been taken to direct the mass of the demoralised fugitives to the bridges in time; 20,000 or 30,000 men were lost in this way, and this must be borne in mind when we judge an exploit in the main glorious to the French arms.

'Much has been said about the disasters of the Beresina; but no one has yet said that the greater part of them could have been averted had the staff, with a better perception of its duties, turned to account the night of the 27th and 28th, and caused the heavy baggage, and especially the multitudes of stragglers, who next day obstructed the passage, to go over the bridges.'

Marbot thus describes the terrible scene of the rupture of the principal bridge:—

'The round shot of Wittgenstein began to fall into the crowd. The enormous masses of men, horses, and chariots became huddled together at the entrance to the bridges, and closed them up without being able to reach them. A great number having failed to approach them were forced by the multitudes into the Beresina and were drowned. To pile up the measure of misfortune, one of the bridges gave way under the pressure of the guns and of the heavy caissons behind. Everyone rushed to the second bridge, and the disorder there was already so great that the strongest men could not stand it. Many were choked and squeezed to death.'

The remains of the army from Moscow and the combined corps of Oudinot and Victor were, perhaps, from 45,000 to 50,000 strong when they escaped from the horrors of the Beresina. They were only feebly pursued by the Russians, who, indeed, were suffering fearfully themselves; but they were greatly reduced by cold and hunger. Marbot had his full share in this part of the retreat, and laboured very successfully to save his regiment. He had once more been severely wounded, but he was able to follow his men on a sledge, and though the 23rd lost nearly all its horses, it had contrived to secure such ample supplies that some 400 troopers recrossed the Niemen, to be joined by, perhaps, 800 at Warsaw. We need not dwell on the closing scenes of the

most disastrous retreat recorded in history. Napoleon left the wreck of the Grand Army at Smorgoni on his return to France; the act has been differently judged by different writers, but it would not have been done by Turenne or Frederick, and the conqueror showed badly in this great reverse of fortune. Murat, given the command, when his master had gone, lost his head, and practically ran away from Wilna; as at Smolensk, the magazines at this place were plundered and wasted by the famished soldiery, and the French crossed the Niemen in little knots and bands from 20,000 to 30,000 spectres, gaunt, in despair, and as a military force ruined. Marbot severely condemns the administration of the country round Wilna during the advance on Moscow; but the Poles had no faith in Napoleon's fair words, and contributions and supplies were not easily obtained. Bands of Poles, actually in the army, robbed the French in the retreat.

'They dressed themselves up as peasants, and, slipping out of the bivouacs when night had fallen, met at a place agreed on, and came back to our camps crying the Cossack war cry, "Hourra! hourra!" They struck terror into the hearts of the weaker class of men, and many of these took to flight, throwing away all they had, and leaving carriages and supplies. After this the supposed Cossacks, after plundering everything, went away, and before daybreak returned to the French columns, where they resumed the name of Poles, only to become Cossacks next night.'

The 23rd crossed the Vistula in this plight, and no regiment in the Grand Army had suffered less:—

'We were almost knee-deep in the half-frozen water, which aggravated the sufferings of the sick and wounded men; but physical pain was as nothing compared with the fears inspired by the cracking of the ice, threatening at every moment to give way under our feet. The servant of one of my officers fell into a hole and was never seen again. At last we reached the opposite bank, and passed the night in the huts of fishermen.'

The number of troops that crossed the Niemen, including the reserves of the Grand Army, was probably half a million of men. The Austrian and Prussian contingents did not suffer much, the last, under Macdonald, on the extreme left, and we may estimate these wings as 60,000 strong. But of the 440,000 men who remained, not 60,000, perhaps, took part in the campaign of 1813; about 150,000 were taken prisoners, and fully 200,000, we believe, perished. Marbot makes the figures considerably less, but he relies on notes taken by Napoleon, who had the strongest interest to conceal the

truth, and he is contradicted by all impartial writers. He has dwelt fairly enough on some of the causes of a catastrophe which can only be compared to the ruin of the hosts of Pharaoh in the Red Sea, or to the destruction of the hordes of Sennacherib. He very properly denies that 'it was all the cold,' and, in fact, the Russians suffered more severely from this than the French.

'The Russian soldiers—it is very remarkable—accustomed to pass the winter in well-cemented habitations, furnished with stoves always heated, were infinitely more susceptible to cold than the soldiers of other parts of Europe; the enemy's army suffered great losses, and this explains why the pursuit was so slow.'

He gives up the idea also that the burning of Moscow had much to do with the issue of events, and that Napoleon, but for this disaster, would have 'emerged in the spring 'like a ship from the ice'—one of his phrases at St. Helena.

'The destruction of Moscow was not complete; sufficient houses, palaces, churches, and barracks remained to lodge the army. . . . Even after the conflagration more provisions were to be found in this immense city than would have sufficed to feed the army for six months. . . . Even had Moscow remained intact, the course of events would not have been changed.'

Unquestionably it was a military mistake—and to this we have referred before—to have made the Austrian and Prussian forces the wings of the invading army; but, apart from the ambiguous conduct of Schwartzemberg, this told far more in the events of 1813 than in those of 1812. Marbot justly dwells on the delay of Napoleon at Moscow as a military cause of the terrible sufferings of the retreat, and he comments on the disloyalty of the Poles, and on the neglect of collecting supplies in Poland, as contributing largely to the catastrophe. The main causes, however, were deeper than these, and have been indicated by more philosophic thinkers. The Grand Army was a bad army; it was full of elements of weakness and discontent, and it was half destroyed before winter began. Had it been the army of Jena or Austerlitz, it would not impossibly have overwhelmed the Russians a few days after the campaign had opened, and the Emperor might have found a Tilsit at Wilna. The principal cause, however, of the result of the contest was that the Napoleonic system of making war was all but impossible in a country like Russia, and amidst sandy and barren steppes and forests; rapid and brilliant manœuvres to be made by troops relying on resources found on the spot, and moving easily on good

roads, could hardly be accomplished in 1812, and Napoleon failed when his method failed him. He tried in vain to carry out his projects, when compelled largely to depend on magazines, and to advance slowly through impassable tracts; this led to delays, long halts, and all kinds of reverses, and he was lured on to Moscow and engulfed in ruin because he could not come up with the enemy, who fell back through a wasted country. As for the patriotism of the Russians, it deserves the highest praise; but it cannot be said that the Russian commanders gave proof of military worth or skill, while, strategically, some of Napoleon's movements were marked by his characteristic genius and power. The disaster is foreshadowed in the Greek myth of Phaeton.

Marbot was sent to Mons to recruit the 23rd, and especially to find new horses for it, in the early spring of 1813. He had been made its full colonel during the retreat from Moscow, the Emperor acknowledging that he was discharging a debt long due. He took no part in the famous battles in Saxony which marked the opening of the campaign of 1813, when Napoleon once more struck down the allies on the historic fields of Lützen and Bautzen. But he has given us many important details as to the reorganisation of the Grand Army which differ from the accounts of most writers, and which seem to bear the character of truth. France, undoubtedly, was one in mind with Napoleon when he made gigantic efforts in 1813 to restore the military supremacy which was slipping from his grasp.

'The great majority of the French people had even yet an extreme confidence in Napoleon. Well-informed persons no doubt blamed him for having advanced to Moscow, and especially for having stayed there until the winter came; but the masses, accustomed to think the Emperor infallible, and having besides no notion of events, and of the real losses incurred by our troops in Russia, only considered the glory thrown on our arms by the capture of Moscow. There was a strong movement in order to give the Emperor the means of bringing victory back to our eagles. Every department, every town, gave patriotic contributions of horses; but this enthusiasm was diminished by the great levies of conscripts which were made, and by the heavy taxes which were raised. Still, on the whole, the nation sacrificed itself with tolerably good grace, and battalions and squadrons rose, as it were, out of the earth by enchantment.'

It has often been said that the French army raised at Napoleon's summons in 1813 was a mere huge assemblage of rude levies; but this, apparently, was not the fact. The elements of military power in France were enormous; and between the goodwill of the nation, persuasion, and force, the

Emperor collected good soldiers in tens of thousands. This account of the composition of the Grand Army in 1813 contradicts that of M. Thiers, and others:—

‘Strange to say, after the great losses of men incurred in France during twenty years, recruiting had never produced so strong and so fine an array of soldiers. This was owing to a number of causes. In the first place, each of the hundred and eight departments, then in existence, had had for several years a company of infantry, called the departmental company, a kind of Prætorian Guard of the prefects, who delighted in procuring for it the best and most able-bodied men. These men never left the chief towns of the department; they were well housed, fed, and clothed; they did very little, and they had sufficient time to gain their full strength, for most of them led this kind of life for six or seven years; and as they were regularly trained in the management of arms, in marching, and in manœuvres, they only wanted the baptism of fire to become admirable troops. The Emperor sent them all to the army, where they were blended with the regiments of the line. These companies, according to the importance of the department, were each of 150, 200, or 250 men. In the second place, a great number of the conscripts of previous years were asked to serve. Some of them, owing to interest, others from abuses, or trickeries, had contrived to be placed at the tail of the dépôts—that is, to stay at home until further orders. Age had made them men nearly all strong and vigorous. These measures were legal; but what was not legal was the call to arms of men who, having already drawn lots for the conscription, and having been liberated, were not the less compelled to serve if they were less than thirty years old. This levy produced a great number of men fit to bear the hardships of war. . . . The submissiveness of the people led the government into a course even more illegal, and more dangerous, because it affected the upper classes; after forcing the men who had been exempted by lot, they forced those who had obtained substitutes, as the law allowed, to take up arms. . . . To these levies, more or less lawful, the Emperor added all the men provided by anticipating the conscription and numerous and excellent battalions composed of sailors.’

The army, however, of 1813 was weak in cavalry, not inured to war, and deficient in organisation and military worth. It was an army for parade, and not for the field.

‘The French army, as I have said, was composed of a fine stock of men; it had never looked so well. But, with the exception of a few regiments, the great mass of these new soldiers had never been under fire; the disasters, too, of the campaign in Russia had injured the self-confidence of the troops, in a way still felt; and thus our fine troops rather formed an army fit to show, in order to obtain peace, than, at this moment, to make war. Nearly all the generals and colonels, who had examined the troops attentively, declared that they required several years of peace.’

Relying on his genius, and on the terror of his name, Napoleon prepared, with this inexperienced force, and with the faithless allies of the Confederation of the Rhine, already stirred by the great rising of Germany, to contend against all Europe for his entire Empire. This is evident from his correspondence in many places, and, indeed, is proved by his retaining garrisons in the fortresses of the Oder and Vistula, all lost to him after the defeat of Leipzig. Marbot properly condemns this extravagant project.

‘I agree with those who proposed the evacuation of the fortresses ; for since, even as their opponents acknowledge, these strong places could be of no use to us, unless we completely overthrew the Russian and Prussian armies, this was all reason the more for increasing our disposable forces, and not for disseminating them over an infinite space.’

It is impossible to form a correct estimate of the number of the belligerent forces which came into conflict in 1813, after the negotiations at Pleistwitz had failed. Reckoning his imprisoned garrisons, and his army of Italy, Napoleon had, perhaps, 600,000 men ; but a large part of these were German contingents, discontented, and watching an opportunity to revolt. On the other hand, the allies disposed of from 800,000 to 900,000 men ; and these do not include the forces of Wellington, who paralysed the best troops of France in Spain, and whose successes at Vittoria had decided Austria to throw in her lot with the Coalition. The Emperor was thus completely overmatched ; and what is perhaps as important, and is not borne in mind by military writers of narrow views, all the moral forces, which have such power in war, but which he would not, obstinately, take into account, were as strongly against him in 1813 as they were against the allies in 1793-4. Germany stood in arms to assert her rights, and to avenge years of oppression and wrong ; Napoleon fought to uphold a despotism, unnatural, monstrous, and that could not endure. Yet he seems to have had little doubts of the issue ; though in Saxony he had not more than 300,000 men to oppose to, probably, 500,000.

‘The Emperor Napoleon, accustomed, by reason of repeated victories, not to estimate the force of his enemies, thought himself once more invincible when he found himself in Germany at the head of 300,000 men ; and he did not sufficiently consider the nature and quality of the forces with which he was to confront all Europe leagued against him. . . . It is positively said that when he saw the foreign diplomats leave the palace of Dresden, he exclaimed, “How well we shall beat them !”’

Unquestionably, from a mere military point of view, the Emperor's hopes were not without foundation. He occupied a central position in the midst of foes, disseminated on a vast circumference, and though, for the moment, closely united, divided by separate and even conflicting interests, by old jealousies, and distinct sympathies, his genius and renown were so dreaded that Continental generals cowered at his approach; and astride on the Elbe, and holding all its passages, he not unreasonably believed that he would repeat the marvels of 1796 on the Adige. The first events of the campaign gave him marked success; he won a victory at Dresden that might have been made decisive; the terror inspired by his arms and the timidity of his foes are well indicated in this passage:—

‘At the command of the Emperor the gates were opened, and a passage was made for a column of the infantry of the Imperial Guard, its first brigade led by Major-General Cambronne. It was like the apparition of Medusa's head. The enemy recoiled panic-stricken, his artillery was captured in a rapid charge, and the gunners were slain beside their carriages. Sallies of the same kind were made from every gate of Dresden, and had similar results; the allies evacuated the redoubts taken by them, and fled into the neighbouring plains. Napoleon caused them to be charged up to the foot of the hills.’

The poor quality of the Austrian infantry is illustrated in the following anecdote; conceive the commander of a British square, at Waterloo, holding a parley of the kind.

‘A division of cuirassiers, under General Bordesoulle, found itself in front of a strong division of Austrian infantry formed in square, and summoned it to lay down its arms. The enemy's general having refused, Bordesoulle rode forward, and remarked that the muskets of his men were too wet to fire. The Austrian replied that his soldiers would defend themselves with their bayonets, and all the more successfully because the horses of the French, stuck knee deep in the mud, could not reach them with their breasts, and bear down on them with the weighty shock which gives cavalry its strength. “Well, I shall smite down your infantry with my guns.” “You have none, for they have been left behind in the mud.” “If I show you the guns in the rear of my leading regiment, will you surrender?” “Certainly, I shall have to do so; for in that case I should have no means of defence.”’

The disaster of Culm effaced Dresden, and was one of the turning points of the war. Marbot throws the blame of the abandonment of Vandamme on St.-Cyr, who, on this great occasion, acted with characteristic disloyal selfishness.

‘The malevolence of St.-Cyr was astonishing when it was a question of supporting a colleague, malevolence which in this instance led General Mortier astray. Neither one nor the other stirred, whereas their

co-operation, added to the vigorous efforts of Vandamme, would certainly have completed the utter defeat of the enemy. In fact, his columns of infantry, of cavalry, of artillery, and of trains were confusedly huddled together in the narrow defiles of the mountains which separate Silesia from Bohemia.'

Napoleon, undoubtedly, ordered St.-Cyr and Mortier to join hands with Vandamme; but the Emperor was unwell—poison has been suspected—and at the instance of his suite he returned to Dresden, one of the most unlucky incidents of his life.

'Caulaincourt advised Napoleon to return to Dresden, and the other great officers did not venture to give the much wiser advice to go on to Pirna, only a league distant. The Young Guard was there already, and the Emperor would have found there the repose he was in need of, and would have enjoyed the immense advantage of being on the spot to direct the movements of the troops engaged in pursuing the enemy. This he could not do at Dresden, far away from the centre of operations. Napoleon thus left St.-Cyr and Mortier with the charge of supporting Vandamme.'

Meanwhile, the secondary armies, thrown out by Napoleon as far as the Oder, to hold Germany down—a departure from the strategy of 1796, and due to the insatiable lust of power—had suffered a series of crushing defeats. Marbot was attached to the corps of Macdonald, an honourable and even an heroic soldier, but not fit to command in chief, like the majority of Napoleon's marshals. He thus describes his superior's character in war:—

'Macdonald, remarkable for his personal courage, was often unfortunate in the field, not that he was without military aptitude, but that, like the generals of the Austrian army, especially the celebrated Mack, he was too exact and exclusive in strategical movements. Before a battle he traced out a plan of operations, which was usually excellent, but he ought to have modified it according to circumstances, and his slow intelligence could not do this. He was like certain chessplayers who, when they direct their own game and that of their adversary, not on the spot, succeed very well as long as they play alone, yet do not know what to do when, in a real match, the adversary arranges his men quite differently from what they had assumed would be the case.'

Marbot distinguished himself greatly at the Katzbach, a defeat which, like Grosbeeren and Dennewitz, destroyed Napoleon's exterior offensive line, and enabled the allies gradually to converge against him. The Emperor lavished rewards on the accomplished soldier.

'On September 28 he reviewed our Corps d'Armée, and gave me extraordinary proof of his esteem; for, though he very seldom gave several

rewards at the same time, he nominated me Officer of the Legion of Honour and Baron of the Empire, and gave me the endowment attached to this rank. He also loaded my regiment with his favours, declaring that it was the only one of Sebastiani's corps which kept in order at the Katzbach, captured guns of the enemy, and repulsed the Prussians wherever they met them.'

October had come, and the immense forces of the allies were gathering in on Leipzig. Four main causes had made the result of the campaign in Saxony altogether different from that of 1796-7 in Italy. In the first place, the long line of the Elbe was much less easy to observe and defend than the short and difficult line of the Adige; and Blücher, in fact, passed it without the Emperor's knowledge. In the next place, Napoleon wasted three armies in his attempt to keep the whole of Germany down; and this, we have seen, had most disastrous results. Again, the allies, probably following the advice of Moreau, did not venture to meet the strokes of Napoleon, like Würmser and Alvinzi, in 1796; they kept aloof from their dreaded enemy, and did not attempt to move against him until his lieutenants had been beaten in detail, and the French army had been cruelly weakened. Yet the most important cause, we believe, was that Napoleon's army was not to be compared with the warriors of Arcola and Rivoli; even the French soldiers had not been trained to war, and the auxiliaries of the Confederation of the Rhine could not be trusted, and were worse than useless. This is the real reason why, at the last moment, the Emperor was forced to abandon the advance on Berlin which, Napier thinks, might have changed the whole course of events.

In these untoward circumstances, Marbot contends, with other writers, that the true strategy of Napoleon would have been to fall back, to hold the strong and defensible line of the Saale, and to weary out the enemies still in awe of him. But the Emperor would make a stand at Leipzig, and trusted to his skill in a great general battle.

'The extreme confidence of this great captain was a cause of his ruin; he did not reflect that his army, much weakened by heavy losses, had many foreigners in its ranks, who only sought a favourable occasion to betray us, and that it was exposed to be overwhelmed by superior forces in the immense plains of Leipzig. He would have done well to have led it into the mountainous region of Thuringia and Hesse, so favourable to the defensive, and so to have nullified part of the forces of the Coalition and its kings. . . . But the confidence felt by Napoleon in himself and in the worth of his troops overbore all other considerations.'

Marbot fairly describes the great days of Leipzig; they hold a conspicuous place in history; but they have little interest for the student of war. The attacks of the allies were feeble all through; they have been compared to the 'peckings of crows round a dying eagle;' and more than once they were nearly defeated. Marbot narrates a curious incident on the eve of the battle; the Russian Czar and the King of Prussia were nearly falling into the hands of the 23rd Chasseurs.

'I was full of hope, when the immoderate ardour of one of my troopers caused my plan to fail. This man, having let his sabre fall, took his carbine in his hands, and from fear lest he should be late when I should give the signal to attack, he fired into the midst of the group, and killed a Prussian major. As you may suppose, all the enemy's officers, who had no escort except a few orderlies, and saw they were on the point of being surrounded, galloped off in the twinkling of an eye. Our men could not follow them far, lest they should fall into the hands of patrols, who were heard advancing. My chasseurs, nevertheless, made two officers prisoners, but could obtain no information from them. But I heard afterwards from my friend, Baron Stock, colonel of the Guards of the Grand Duke of Darmstadt, that the Emperor Alexander of Russia and the King of Prussia were among the officers who were on the point of being captured by the French near the Swedish redoubt. Had this happened, the fortunes of Europe would have been changed.'

Marbot is naturally indignant at the defection of the Saxons and other German contingents on the field of battle; for this, perhaps, decided the issue of events at Leipzig. But Napoleon at least had had fair warning, and woe betide the commander who compels his troops to choose between loyalty to the flag and patriotic duty! Marbot, also, severely condemns Jomini for taking part with the allies, like Moreau;* but Jomini has fairly justified himself; and that three men so completely different as Bernadotte, Moreau, and Jomini were, should have been found in armies hostile to France, is significant of the indignation caused by Napoleon's crushing and universal tyranny. Marbot gives us this anecdote about Jomini:—

'The Emperor Alexander, to the amazement of Europe, rewarded Jomini for his treason by making him one of his aides-de-camp, and this so shocked the delicacy of feeling of the Emperor of Austria, that,

* See the Life of Jomini, by Colonel Le Comte, sometime Jomini's first aide-de-camp. This veteran officer is still alive; he is almost the last link with a great age of war, and he is one of the best military critics of our time.

as he was dining one day with Alexander, and perceived Jomini among the guests, he exclaimed quite aloud, "I knew that sovereigns must sometimes make use of deserters, but I did not imagine that they would receive them on their staff, and even admit them to their table."

Marbot dwells with just pride on the heroic stand made by the French army on the last day of Leipzig. Out-numbered, betrayed, and almost surrounded, they fought as became their noble race.

'The battle, celebrated by the enemy as a triumph, was, nevertheless, indecisive. Though very inferior in numbers, confronted by all the nations of Europe, and having multitudes of traitors in our ranks, we did not yield an inch of ground. General Sir Robert Wilson, English commissioner at the battle of Leipzig, a man whose testimony cannot be suspected of partiality, has written thus on the subject:—"In spite of the defection of the Saxon army in the midst of the engagement, and of the obstinate and brilliant courage of the allies, it was found impossible to take from the French a single one of the villages considered by them essential to their position. Night closed the battle, leaving to the French, and especially to the defenders of Probstheyda, the glory of inspiring their enemies with noble envy."

Leipzig, in fact, would have been a drawn battle but for the frightful disasters that followed, and that almost destroyed the Grand Army. Marbot cites some writers to show that Napoleon did not neglect the all-important duty of thoroughly bridging the Pleisse and the Elster, when his want of munitions forced him to retreat; but these are questionable witnesses at best. The Emperor's correspondence is a blank on the subject, and more than one passage in his career proves that he sometimes omitted to take precautions which would have been taken by very inferior men. Marbot points out what ought to have been done:—

'There was but one way to make our retreat secure; a great number of culverts should have been constructed upon the water meadows, the ditches, and the little streams, and larger bridges should have been made over the Partha, the Pleisse, and especially the Elster, which receive their feeders at the gates and even within the town of Leipzig. Nothing would have been more easy than to form these indispensable passages, for the town and the suburbs of Leipzig, at a musket-shot's distance, could have provided an immense quantity of beams, of planks, of boards, of nails, of ropes, and so forth.'

The necessary measures were not adopted.

'The whole army thought that many passages had been constructed as soon as it had reached Leipzig, and that these had been multiplied on the 16th, and especially on the 17th October, for there had been no engagement on that day. Well, owing to a concourse

of circumstances most deplorable, and giving proof of incredible negligence, no precautions of the kind were taken. There is literally nothing official in the documents relating to the famous battle to show that anything was done to facilitate, in the event of a retreat, the escape of the numerous columns engaged beyond the defiles formed by the rivers and the town of Leipzig and its suburbs.'

Napoleon possibly relied on Berthier to give the orders required and to bridge the rivers. But Berthier, like three-fourths of the marshals, was a mere servitor, without resource in himself, who required a command from his master to do anything.

'Great as was the activity and vast the capacity of the Emperor, it was physically impossible that he could see after and direct everything; and yet if he forgot anything of importance, nothing was done. It seems that it was so at Leipzig. Most of the marshals and corps commanders repeatedly, and especially during the last two days, made Berthier aware how necessary it was to establish a number of passages, in order to secure the means of retreat in the event of a reverse; but the regular answer of the major-general was, "The Emperor has given me no orders." Nothing more could be got from him; and thus not a beam, not a plank, had been thrown over the single stream when, on the night of the 18th-19th, the Emperor ordered a general retreat on Weissenfels and the Saale.'

According to Marbot, the allied armies had suffered so much that they were about to fall back, until their chiefs perceived the French preparing to retreat.

'The allies had lost so many men that they felt it impossible to renew the conflict; they had not dared to attack us again; and they were on the point of retiring when they perceived the impedimenta of the army on the way to Weissenfels, by Lindenau. They then knew that Napoleon was making ready to retreat, and they did what they could to turn to account the opportunities this movement might chance to give them.'

The French army defiled out of Leipzig, having one bridge only to cross the Elster—it was the same at Lobau in 1809—neglect that caused fatal delay and cost thousands of lives. The allies had refused to spare the town, and Napoleon's lieutenants urged their master to set fire to it, and thus to place a barrier between the pursuing and the retreating armies. The Emperor, however, refused to take this course, justifiable in a military sense, not probably from a chivalrous feeling, but because he did not wish to sanction an act which would have made an enemy even of the King of Saxony, his only remaining ally in Germany.

'I think that the refusal of the allies to consent not to molest us on the retreat gave us a right to adopt all feasible means of defence; and,

as a conflagration in this case would have been the most efficacious means, we should have made use of it. Napoleon, however, could not make up his mind to this act; and this extravagant magnanimity cost him his crown, for the ensuing engagement caused him to lose almost as many men as the three days' battle which he had just fought. It was even much more disastrous, for it disorganised the army, which otherwise might have reached France in formidable strength.'

The allies fell presently on the French army, delayed and entangled in the defile of the one bridge that formed their sole avenue of escape. Hideous scenes of massacre and bloodshed followed; and the Saxons and Badeners slaughtered their late masters, just as more than once the auxiliaries rose against the Legions when they had the chance.

' Marshal Blucher and his Prussians, the Russians, and the Austrians did likewise, and attacked on all sides the rearguards of the French columns retreating by the bridge of Lindenau. To fill up the measure of woes, sharp volleys of musketry cracked by the bridge on the Elster, the only line of retreat open to our men. This fusillade was the work of the Saxon Guards, who, having been left in the town to protect their sovereign, and regretting that they could not desert like the other regiments of their army, were eager to give proof of their German patriotism, and attacked from behind the French, who were passing the courtyard of the château where their king had his abode. In vain this ill-fated and venerable prince appeared at the balcony of the palace, and, amidst a rain of bullets, cried out to his officers and soldiers, "Cowards, kill me!" "Kill your king, and let him not be a witness of your dishonour!" The wretches went on massacring the French. In his indignation the King of Saxony returned to his rooms, caught up the flag of his guard, and threw it into the fire. In these unhappy circumstances the basest blow was struck at our troops by a battalion of Badeners, left in the town as they were all cowards. These scoundrels, hidden behind the windows and walls of the principal baking-house, fired on our soldiers, and killed a great many of them.'

The climax of these horrors was reached when the news spread that the bridge had been blown up, through a mistake that has never been fully explained. A large part of the French army was thus cut off; thousands perished in the stream of the Elster, thousands were made prisoners by the exulting allies, and the appalling scenes of the Beresina were renewed. A sapper had been charged to destroy the bridge when the army had effected its retreat; but the explosion of the mine had been premature, and obviously a duty of this supreme importance ought not to have been left to a single man. The stricken army threw the blame on Berthier, who excused himself by the customary plea.

'The opinion of the army charged the major-general with negligence; it was justly said that he ought to have employed a whole brigade to watch the bridge, and that its commander should have been directed, on his personal responsibility, to give orders to fire the powder only when he saw that the occasion had come. Berthier defended himself with his common reply, "The Emperor gave no such order!"'

Marbot thus describes what he witnessed himself at the head of the 23rd Chasseurs:—

'Every moment the columns, especially those of artillery and cavalry, were stopped at the passage of broad ditches, of marshes, and of brooks, which might easily have been bridged. The wheels and the horses sank in the mud; and, as the night was very dark, there was confusion everywhere; our march was extremely slow.'

The army did not greet the Emperor with wonted acclaim; the French soldiery were too intelligent not to see that their chief had been gravely to blame.

'Day broke; the road, broad and good, was covered with troops of all arms, a token that the army would still be considerable when it should reach the Saale. The Emperor passed by; but as he galloped along the flank of the columns, he did not hear the joyous shouts which usually welcomed his presence. The army was displeased, for no care had been taken to secure its retreat after it had left the field of battle.'

These operations strikingly illustrate the two main defects of the Grand Army. The staff was far from good, as the Duc de Fezensac has shown in many notable instances; and the Emperor's lieutenants could not think for themselves or do anything without an express order from a master who could not provide for everything. This is the exact opposite in the case of the present German army; the staff formed by Moltke is the best in Europe, and the chiefs of each *corps d'armée* have been specially trained to take the initiative and to act for themselves—a discipline which the great Greek historian declares was one main cause of the superiority of Sparta in war.

The French army, a dissolving wreck, made its way slowly across the Saxon plains until it had taken refuge in the fortresses of the Rhine. A gleam of light shone on the perishing host when Wrede and his Bavarians crossed the path of Napoleon, and, like Tchitchakoff at the Beresina, were foiled at Hanau. Marbot and the remains of his fine regiment were quartered for a few weeks at Nimeguen, and he was sent from that place to command at Mons and to keep down the department of Jemappes. Belgium was

already rising against Napoleon, but Marbot sternly did his duty, though every sound he heard and every sight he saw were signs of the toppling down of the Empire. At the instigation of the chief men of the district the authorities of Mons assisted the governor to leave the fortress quietly with his French troops. The following scene, characteristic of one of Napoleon's soldiers, is recorded by Marbot as though he was proud of it:—

'I made up my mind to show my teeth, and told M. Duval that I requested him to assemble the municipal council and the notables, and I would give them my answer. . . . I informed my soldiers of the proposal that had been made to me to evacuate the town entrusted to our charge. They were indignant, and spoke out. I told them that I would not conceal the fact that the ramparts were broken down at several points, and were without guns, and that, therefore, it would be difficult to defend them against regular troops. Nevertheless, if the case occurred, we would fight boldly; but if, contrary to the laws of nations, the population of the town and of the neighbourhood should attack us, we would not stand on the defensive, but would deal with them as with rebels. I ordered my soldiers to occupy the church steeple, and, after waiting half an hour and beating the drum three times, they should fire upon any crowd that filled the streets, while patrols were to scatter all who choked up the ways, and especially should shoot down the peasants, who had left their work to molest us. I added that, if a collision took place, I should order, as the best means of defence, that the town should be set on fire to engage the attention of the citizens, and that a constant fusillade should be maintained upon the conflagration, to prevent them putting it out.'

Marbot took no part in the memorable campaign of 1814, on the Marne and the Seine, and did not witness the surrender of Paris. His comments on these events contain nothing new, and we pass them by without further notice. After Napoleon's extraordinary escape from Elba, he was called again to join the imperial eagles; and he commanded the 7th Hussars in the campaign of Waterloo. The Emperor gave him a brigade for his conduct at the brief cavalry skirmish of Genappes; but the Government of the Restoration annulled the promotion, and he remained in his old grade for many years. On the 18th of June he was on the extreme right of the French army, under the command of D'Erlon; and a letter from his pen throws much light on one of the most disputed passages of the campaign, the relations between Napoleon and his lieutenant Grouchy. This is not the place to discuss at length the unfortunate operations of Grouchy; but Napoleon positively asserts that he ordered Grouchy to send a detachment to him early on the 18th, and

to fall on the left flank of Wellington—the counterpart of the attack on the flank and rear of Blücher which Ney was directed to make on the 16th; and though the assertion has been pronounced false, it is strongly corroborated by Marbot's evidence. Marbot was despatched by Napoleon to join hands with Grouchy.

‘Special orders, on the part of the Emperor, were given me by his aide-de-camp Labédoyère, and by another orderly officer, whose name I cannot recollect. . . . Officers *en reconnaissance* were to inform me, through hussars galloping from post to post, of their junction with the troops of Marshal Grouchy and his advanced guard, which were to arrive from the Dyle. . . . A note from Captain Eloy, transmitted to me by the intermediate posts, informed me that he had met no troops at Moustier, nor yet at Ottignies.’

Marbot says that Eloy received his orders at about 11 a.m., before the battle began. Instead of Grouchy, Marbot met Bülow's Prussians, and sent word to Napoleon at once. The Emperor insisted that Grouchy must be at hand, and that he was coming across the Dyle, if not by the bridges of Moustier and Ottignies, by that of Limal.

‘The Emperor desired me to push on boldly, that this force must be the corps of Marshal Grouchy advancing from Limal, and driving before him some stray Prussians, part of whom I had captured.’

This letter also, in part, explains another debateable passage in the campaign. It has been assumed from Soult's despatch to Grouchy, sent from Napoleon's lines at 10 a.m. on the 18th, and enjoining the marshal to march on Wavre, that Grouchy was authorised to make this movement by the roads on the right bank of the Dyle—that is, far away from the main French army; but Marbot's report confutes this assumption. It shows that Napoleon expected Grouchy to have crossed to the left bank of the Dyle, and that, therefore, if he was to advance to Wavre, he was to draw near to Napoleon's army, and this, indeed, is indicated by Soult's letter, which directs Grouchy to approach the Emperor. Marbot's statements do infinite credit to Gérard, who, the instant he heard the thunder of Waterloo, urged Grouchy to cross the Dyle at Moustier and Ottignies; and they strongly confirm the censures which have been passed on Grouchy. We guard, ourselves, however, from giving an opinion on what might have been the result at Waterloo had Grouchy taken the true strategic course, which he ought to have taken when he broke up from Gembloux.

Marbot was exiled from France in 1815, and remained

in disgrace under the régime of the Bourbons. Like many of Napoleon's veteran soldiers, he was treated with distinction by the Monarchy of July; became an aide-de-camp of the Duke of Orleans, and afterwards of the Comte de Paris; and did good service in the Algerian wars. He died a general of division in 1854, having just had time to hear that the new-fledged imperial eagles had whetted their beaks in the blood of the race which had destroyed the old birds in 1812. As we close this valuable and charming work, one thought strikes a reflecting mind. This is a record of war in unparalleled grandeur, of an exhibition of genius of the highest order, of the heroic qualities brought out by war and giving war its tragic but profound interest. But it is a record also of appalling sufferings, of generations thinned and maimed by the sword, of lasting injury done to the estate of man—of the arrest, nay, of the putting back, of human progress. The French Revolution was the cause of all this: has not that cataclysm done more evil than good?

ART. VII.—*The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma.* Published under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, edited by W. T. BLANFORD.

1. *Mammalia.* By W. T. BLANFORD, F.R.S. 1888–1891.
2. *Birds.* By EUGENE W. OATES. 1889–1891.
3. *Reptilia and Batrachia.* By GEORGE A. BOULENGER. 1890.
4. *Fishes.* By FRANCIS DAY, C.I.E., LL.D. 1889.
5. *Beast and Man in India.* By JOHN LOCKWOOD KIPLING, C.I.E. 1891.

THAT enormous dependency which has gradually accrued to us in India is so inexhaustible a source of interest to the lover of nature that its varied products cannot fail to call forth the spontaneous zeal of naturalists; and they have already done so in various noteworthy instances. Nevertheless, though, as a rule, we prefer work done by private effort and voluntary association, the field offered to the observer by the fauna of India is so vast that we heartily welcome the action of the Government in promoting and publishing the series of excellent volumes enumerated at the head of this article. By such authority alone could we hope to secure

a treatment at once adequate and similar of the various sections of the vast field of zoology. The description of all Indian birds, beasts, reptiles, and fishes has now been completed with the exception of the concluding portion of the 'Ornithology of India.' This, owing to the unfortunate and unexpected recall of M. Eugene W. Oates, is now about to be at once carried to its conclusion by the able editor of the whole work, the second part of whose special portion (the 'Mammals of India') has just been issued to the public. The natural history of the lower animals will follow in due order, and three volumes on the moths of India are now being prepared for the press.

But, before entering upon any of the more technical matters with which these valuable scientific volumes deal, we desire to call the reader's attention to the work of Mr. Lockwood Kipling, one of the most pleasing and instructive volumes which we have had the good fortune to peruse. It treats of but a small portion of the whole field of Indian zoology, because its author makes no profession of describing all its wild animals. He deals successively with various kinds of mammals, birds, and reptiles, almost exclusively as regards their life-history and habits in relation to the human inhabitants of Hindostan. Mr. Kipling's book is not only exceedingly well written, with many attractive touches of humour, but we also owe to him a number of excellent and instructive illustrations, almost all of which were drawn by his own able hand. The poetry prefixed to each of the chapters is due to the pen of his accomplished son, who has shown both in prose and verse a marvellous power of bringing before the reader the scenery and the life of India. Each of these little fragments has in it a reality which is the gift of genius.

One fact Mr. Kipling informs us of, which may well excite surprise, is the cruelty, or at least the utter indifference to suffering, of the 'mild Hindu,' who is so scrupulous and apprehensive about destroying the life of the meanest insect. Certainly most persons (especially if acquainted with the manners of Southern Italy) would be disposed to agree with Mr. Lecky in giving the Brahmans credit for a decided superiority over Christians as regards their treatment of animals. Yet it appears that the Act passed so late as the 21st of March, 1890, by the Legislative Council of India, for the prevention of cruelty to animals, was one really needed by a people whom we have had so often held up to us as models of kindness and compassion.

The fact is we have in Hindostan a notable and instructive example of the difference between actions due to superstitious beliefs and ritual requirements, and actions springing from real kindness and good feeling. He tells us:—

‘The Hindu worships the cow, and, as a rule, is reluctant to take the life of any animal except in sacrifice. But that does not preserve the ox, the horse, and the ass from being unmercifully beaten, over-driven, over-laden, under-fed, and worked with sores under their harness; nor does it save them from abandonment to starvation when unfit for work, and to a lingering death, which is made a long torture by birds of prey. . . . And the same code which exalts the Brahman and the cow, thrusts the dog, the ass, the buffalo, the pig, and the low-caste man beyond the pale of merciful regard.’ (P. 3.)

Besides this, men of low caste are not forbidden to kill, nor are Hindus generally such vegetarians as is commonly supposed. Nearly all of them will eat fish, and the number of those who will sometimes partake of mutton and kid is ever on the increase. It is true these practices are often verbally disguised by an hypocrisy which is the outcome of superstition. Thus:—

‘Hindus living among Hindus of higher caste will call mutton *lal sâg*—red vegetable—and fish, water beans; while prawns are ennobled as Shiva biscuits, but they are eaten all the same.’ (P. 7.)

Although men of certain castes will keep a cloth in front of their mouths and brush the ground before sitting down lest they should involuntarily kill some small insect, yet these are only observances of their caste and in no way affect their actions in other respects. Thus, they would rather die than touch or help a dying man of a low caste near their own door.

The real cause of this reluctance to take life is the general belief in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. But, in spite of apparent conservatism, the religious belief of India is continually changing:—

‘The High Gods, described in the works one may call “official,” may not be quite dead, but they are practically superseded in favour of witchcraft, demonolatry, and fetishism, or by vulgar manifestations, usually of an orgiastic type. Wholesale slaughter and blood are constantly associated with these Gods, Godlings, and Demons.’

Almost every one regards the existence in India of hospitals for brutes as being by itself an ample proof of a widely diffused spirit of kindness to animals. There are, however, but three in the whole country, and of these we read:—

'They are not hospitals in the true sense, for ailments are not treated, but simply refuges for halt, maimed, diseased, and blind creatures, for whom nobody cares. . . . Ritual reverence for life does not include the performance of acts of mercy. It is enough to save the animal from immediate death, and to place food within its reach. So you see these creatures with unset broken limbs, with hoofs eighteen inches long, and monstrous wens. The dogs were a heartrending sight, confined, with nothing to do but fight, insufficiently fed, and all afflicted with one equal misery of mange.' (P. 10.)

Nevertheless many animals, after all, do benefit by the absence of at least an aggressive cruelty common enough with us. Village boys never tie dogs' tails together or stone frogs or set dogs at cats—so Mr. Kipling assures us.

In commencing our review of Indian animals we shall, in harmony with the most modern views, start with those reputed 'poor relations' of ours, the monkeys—certainly not the least interesting of our Indian live stock. Of these Mr. Blanford informs us we possess more than two dozen different kinds. That most man-like of apes, the orang-utan, who might from the gravity of his mien be a simian philosopher, is not amongst the number, though common in Borneo. Nevertheless we possess two species of another group of man-like monkeys—the gibbons or 'long-armed apes.' These, in some respects, more resemble us in form than do any others of those distinguished as being 'anthropoid' *par excellence*. Such is the case as concerns the length of their legs compared with that of the body; yet this character is commonly overlooked on account of the enormous elongation of their arms, which reach down to the ground when the trunk is perfectly erect. They have no vestige of a tail. Their agility is most wonderful. They will swing themselves from branch to branch by their long arms with such amazing rapidity that they seem almost to fly through the forest. They are found nowhere in the world but in South-Eastern Asia, though, in tertiary times, a gibbon, much larger than any now existing, roamed through the forests of the South of France. They feed on fruit, leaves, insects, birds' eggs, and young birds, and they seek their food by day, part of which they also spend in rest. From daybreak till within two or three hours of noon, and again towards evening, they give forth their powerful cries, which are very remarkable. We have often listened to the sounds they emit, which are sometimes more like the chanting of human voices than are those made by any other group of apes. They are often exceedingly gentle and make excellent pets, although

they have the power of inflicting very serious wounds with their long and sharp canine or eye teeth.

Of the two Indian species, the Hoolock comes from the hill ranges south of Assam, and is well known in Bengal. Mr. Kipling writes that it

'is well adapted for captivity, if a pair can be secured, and the keeper does not object to a gentle, mournful, and timid animal, the spirit of the complaining dove in the form of a black djinn or demon, with a voice like a pack of hounds in full cry.' (P. 64.)

Every one knows that the Hindus reverence monkeys, and has heard of the sacred monkey—the Hanumān or Langūr, which we know as the Entellus monkey, and have often had captive in our Zoological Gardens. It has greyish fur, with black face and paws. Mr. Kipling tells us that the respect in which these animals are held results from the popularity of Hanumān—or (in Southern India) Māruti—the monkey general of the great Hindu epic, who has become one of the most widely worshipped of Hindu gods. As to the habits of these animals he adds:—

'In some parts of India troops of langūrs come bounding with a mighty air of interest and curiosity to see the railway trains pass, their long tails uplifted like notes of interrogation; but frequently, when fairly perched on wall or tree alongside, they seem to forget all about it, and avert their heads as you go by, with an affectation of languid indifference. . . . Under a benign rule of protection the monkey increases rapidly, and, being a daring and mischievous pilferer, becomes a serious nuisance. . . . Indian shops have no doors or windows, but are like large cupboards, open to the street, in which food-grains and other articles are exposed for sale; and in towns where Hindus preponderate, and a busy current of trade has not swept the streets, bulls, calves, parakeets, sparrows, and monkeys take tolls, which the dealer would fain prevent, but that he is few and fat, while the depredators are many and active. A stout grocer nodding among his store baskets, while a monkey, intently watching the sleeper's face, rapidly stuffs his cheek-pouches with grain, is a common sight, as well as a comical one. Of late years the tradesmen, who form the bulk of the members of our municipalities, have felt that there are too many Hanumāns abroad, and have ventured on proceedings that would not have been tolerated in the days of complete Brahmanical ascendancy. Numbers of the marauders have been caught, caged, and despatched on bullock carts to places many miles distant. There they have been let loose; but, as the empty carts returned, the monkeys, quick to perceive and defeat the plan of their enemies, bounded gaily alongside, and trooped in through the city gates with the air of a holiday party returning from a picnic.' (P. 68.)

Though the Hanumāns lead so peaceful an existence as

regards their relations with human beings, they are by no means uniformly peaceful among themselves. Mr. T. H. Hughes has described* a contest between two communities of Hanumāns, which took place apparently for the possession of a cluster of mangroves. In this encounter only champion males of each flock engaged at first, and as soon as one was killed the females came to the assistance of the survivor. Ordinarily the females are submissive and kept well under by their lords, but, according to Mr. Kipling's observations, they are ready enough to assert female monkey rights when the opportunity offers. He saw a monkey which had been so wounded that one hand hung powerless, while he went slowly along supporting himself on his wife's shoulder. Thereupon, says our author:—

‘We threw them bread and raisins, and the wounded warrior carefully stowed the greater part away in his cheek-pouch. The faithful wife, seeing her opportunity, sprang on him, holding fast his one sound hand, and opening his mouth, she deftly scooped out the store of raisins. Then she sat and ate them very calmly at a safe distance, while he mowed and chattered in impotent rage. He knew that without her help he could not reach home, and was fain to wait with what patience he might till the raisins were finished. It was a sad sight, but, like more sad sights, touched with the light of comedy. This was probably her first chance of disobedience, or of self-assertion, in her whole life, and I am afraid she thoroughly enjoyed it. Then she led him away, possibly to teach him more salutary lessons of this modern and “advanced” sort, so that at the last he would go to another life with a meek and chastened soul.’ (P. 72.)

As to the ordinary daily life of these creatures, he declares

‘its main fact to be the tyranny of the leading male of each troop, who grows to a great size.’ His large canine teeth ‘are used unsparingly on the younger male members of the troop, in fighting for his place of power, and on disobedient females. “The demon” was the familiar name we gave to a leader with whom we were well acquainted. He seemed to be always angry, and was easily moved to a paroxysm of rage. . . . He took the lion's share of everything, especially resenting that the rising bachelors of the troop should have a chance. Mothers and babies were merely cuffed aside from a morsel, but there was ruthless war between him and all who might become his rivals.’ (P. 70.)

Mr. Kipling shows an edifying absence of prejudice, in these days only too rare, in frankly noting instances of the

* In the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1884), p. 147.

stupidity of monkeys. After telling his readers of the credulity of the natives—who are ready to credit apes with so much reason as to believe that they only refrain from speech to avoid slavery, he informs us that nevertheless

‘the inability of the monkey to make for itself a shelter against the heavy rains of the country is noted in proverbs. It is really curious that in the Simla region, where are many built-out roads, forming dry refuges of quite natural aspect, they are never resorted to. Troops of monkeys will sit shivering for hours in driving storms within a few yards of covered spaces which seem as if specially provided for their shelter and comfort.’ (P. 70.)

The commonest of all the Indian monkeys is the *Rhesus* or Bengal monkey, which is found to a height of 8,500 feet, near Simla. It belongs to a different group from that to which the Hanumān pertains, and it does possess cheek-pouches. Mr. Blanford informs us that

‘although this monkey is not regarded as sacred by the Hindus, it is never molested by them, and in many parts of the country is as impudent as the Hanumān, and even more mischievous. Very intelligent, and, when young, fairly docile, it is one of the commonest animals kept tame, and throughout Northern India it is the monkey carried about by itinerant showman, and taught to perform tricks of various kinds. It is a most amusing creature, the incarnation of mischief and curiosity, but frequently rather ill-tempered . . . they are perpetually screaming and fighting, or teasing each other; in fact, they behave like unruly children. The Rhesus monkey swims well, and takes readily to water.’ (P. 14.)

Mr. Kipling records a quaint episode which occurred when some itinerant showmen, like those above referred to, happened in his presence to bring some tame monkeys, with a goat, into the presence of some wild ones :—

‘The wild monkeys drew off at first suspiciously, but when the man sat down to his performance and made their tame brethren dance, put on strange raiment, and mount the goat, they crept closer, with horrified curiosity and evident disgust. The tame monkeys off duty regarded their free kinsmen with listless indifference, and the artiste at work never seemed to glance at them, though they watched him with jealous angry eyes, much, I imagine, as labourers on strike watch blacklegs.’ (P. 73.)

He also relates an amusing incident with respect to their family life :—

‘Monkey mothers are tender to their little ones, with a care that endears them to the child-loving Oriental. The babies are quaint little mites, with the brown hair that afterwards stands up crest-wise, parted in the middle of their brows; their wistful faces are full of

wrinkles, and their mild hazel eyes have a quick glancing timidity, that well suits their pathetic, lost-kitten-like cry. Yet even in the forest there are frisky matrons. I have seen a mother monkey, disturbed in her gambols on the ground by the whining of a tiny baby left halfway up an adjacent tree, suddenly break off, and hastily shinning up the tree, snatch up the baby, hurry to the very topmost branch, when she plumped it down, as who should say, "Tiresome little wretch!" and then come down to resume her play. Thus is a mischievous midshipman mast-headed, and thus is the British baby sent up to the nursery while mamma amuses herself.

A very curious monkey, of Southern India, is the *Wanderoo*, which has a tufted tail, and is entirely black, save for a quantity of long grey hairs which project outwards (like a ruff) from all sides of the face except the forehead. It is a shy and wary animal, and apt to be sulky and savage in captivity. It goes about in troops of from twelve to twenty, or more, individuals, but it must be exceptional as regards its domestic arrangements if there is truth in the following contemptuous comparison made by some of the natives of India between these monkeys and the Veddahs: 'The Veddahs are like Wanderoos, they have only got one wife each!'

The most noticeable wild animals, after monkeys, are beasts of prey, of which Mr. Kipling naturally says little, his work being dedicated almost exclusively to animals in more or less friendly relations with man. As to those redoubtable beasts the lion and the tiger, Mr. Blanford tells us that the former is verging on extinction, though a few are probably still living in the wildest tracts of Rājputana. In 1866 a fine one was shot near Allahabad. Formerly these beasts seem to have been generally distributed over North-Western and Central India. Their food consists of deer, wild pigs, and cattle, and they used to be very destructive of camels. They are very noisy animals, their habit of roaring, especially in the evening and at night, always forcing itself on observation in regions inhabited by them.

Tigers, however, are still abundant in many parts and are very generally distributed.

'They still occur wherever large tracts of forest or grass-jungle exist; but within the last twenty or thirty years the number has been greatly reduced. . . . In the forests, at the base of the Himalayas, tigers are common, and they ascend the hills occasionally to an elevation of 6,000 or 7,000 feet, but none are found in the interior of the mountains.' (P. 60.)

They have entirely disappeared throughout a large area of the Central Provinces, in many parts of Bengal, and several

districts of the Bombay Presidency, and they are wanting in Lower Sind, Cutch, and Ceylon. But they exist in Burma and also Sumatra and Java. Tigers roam about in pairs or alone at night and rest during the day after eight or nine o'clock, up to which time their course is sometimes revealed by the cries of monkeys and peafowl, the chatter of birds and the bark of deer. They swim well and will even cross arms of the sea, but they rarely climb, and seem quite unable to ascend a vertical stem, though the marks of their claws may often there be seen to a height of 10 feet or more, as, like cats, they like to scratch wood.

'The ordinary game-eating tiger of the forest lives mainly on deer and pigs, and avoids the neighbourhood of human habitations. Almost all tigers, however, occasionally kill cattle. The wild animals commonly eaten by tigers are pigs, deer of all kinds, nylgai, four-horned antelopes, and porcupines. The last are evidently a common prey. . . . Bears, though not often attacked, occasionally fall victims. . . . Instances are said to have been known of even young elephants being attacked. . . . In fact, a hungry tiger will probably kill any animal he can for food . . . catching and eating frogs. Mr. Simson found tigers in Eastern Bengal, during inundations, feeding upon fish, tortoises, crocodiles, and large lizards; and he once killed a tiger the pouch of which was crammed with grasshoppers or locusts. . . . Great numbers of domestic animals are killed annually, and many tigers appear to live entirely upon cattle. . . . Sheep and goats are not so often attacked, tigers having a distinct preference for beef, but ponies, and even horses and camels, are occasionally killed. Buffaloes in a herd are fully able to defend themselves, and generally attack a tiger, many instances being recorded in which they have rescued their herdsman. . . . The ordinary cattle-eating tiger is the greatest of cowards in the presence of man, and often allows himself to be pelted off from the animal he has seized. . . . I once found two young children, the elder not more than eight or nine years old, left in the jungle to drive a tiger away from the body of a bullock he had killed, and to prevent his eating it or dragging it away. The half-wild inhabitants of the Indian forests have but little fear of ordinary tigers; and, after twenty years' wanderings in large part through tracts infested with tigers, I agree with Forsyth that, except in the haunts of a man-eater, there is little danger in traversing any part of the jungles.' (P. 62.)

Mr. Blanford, however, makes an exception with respect to a tigress with cubs, wounded tigers, and a hungry one that has just killed a prey. The 'man-eater' appears to be a tiger which has got either very fat, old, or otherwise more or less disabled, or else a tigress with cubs to feed when other food is scarce—man being an exceptionally easy game to kill.

'A tiger that has once taken to man-eating will probably, having got

over his innate fear of the human species, continue to live upon the same prey . . . and a fearful scourge such a tiger becomes. The destruction of human life by tigers is still considerable in India . . . in Lower Bengal alone, in six years (1860-66), 4,218 persons were killed by these animals.'

Tigers kill such a creature as a bullock by breaking its neck. They clutch the forequarters with their paws and then seizing the throat in their jaws, force the neck suddenly backwards and to one side. Though they habitually kill their own food, tigers do not disdain carrion, and sometimes a tiger that has been shot will be devoured by another tiger. They are much less noisy than lions, and it is an exception for their roaring to attract attention.

As might be supposed, many superstitions attach to the tiger. It is an object of propitiatory worship with some wild tribes, and formerly an oath used to be sometimes administered on a tiger's skin in courts of justice. Teeth, claws, &c., are worn as charms, and Jerdon tells us that, in Southern India, the possession of its whiskers is considered to render their possessor irresistible to the fair sex. One very curious belief is that the spirits of men killed by tigers sit upon his head to warn him against danger, and, taking part against their fellow creatures, help him to destroy them.

Leopards, which are generally distributed throughout India and Ceylon, also occasionally take to man-eating, and are even a greater scourge than tigers owing to their superior courage. From 1857-60 they were particularly destructive in Central India, taking men, women, and children by night out of houses or off the platforms built in the fields to watch the crops from. One is said to have killed 200 human beings in two years. Mr. Blanford says:—

'The leopard is much more lithe and active even than the tiger, climbing trees readily, and making immense bounds clear off the ground. It is often found in the neighbourhood of villages, hiding during the day amongst the crops or in the bushes above cultivation, and carrying off sheep, goats, and especially dogs, at night. . . . He can conceal himself in the most wonderful way, his spotted hide blending with the ground, and his lithe form being compressible into an inconceivably small space.' (P. 69.)

India is the home of fifteen other species of cats, large and small, including the Chetah or hunting leopard, which roams throughout a great portion of the peninsula, from the Punjab through Rájputana and Central India to the confines of Bengal, but not north of the Ganges or on the Malabar coast. This animal is in great request for sport and

is an adjunct to the state of many Indian Princes. Many of them, when tamed, are as gentle and docile as a dog and delight in being petted, being even good-tempered with strangers, rubbing themselves against them, and purring as cats do. They require about six months to tame after being caught in nooses, which are pegged to the ground around trees they are known to frequent. His taming is thus described by Mr. Kipling :—

‘He is tied in all directions, principally from a thick grummet of rope round his loins, while a hood fitted over his head effectually blinds him. He is fastened on a strong cot-bedstead, and the keepers and their wives and families reduce him to submission by starving him and keeping him awake. His head is made to face the village street, and for an hour at a time several times a day his keepers make pretended rushes at him, and wave cloths, staves, and other articles in his face. He is talked to continually, and women’s tongues are believed to be the most effective anti-soporifics. No created being could resist the effects of hunger, want of sleep, and feminine scolding, and the poor chetah becomes piteously, abjectly tame. . . . It is difficult to give a just idea of the curious intimacy with animals that exists in India amongst those who have charge of them. The chetah’s bedstead is like that of the keeper, and, when the creature is tamed, leopard and man are often curled under the same blanket. When his bedfellow is restless, the keeper lazily stretches out an arm from his end of the cot and dangles a tassel over the animal’s head, which seems to soothe him.’ (P. 329.)

When taken to hunt, the chetah is hooded and fastened by a leather belt to the bullock-cart on which it is driven out to the neighbourhood of the antelopes it is to catch. These have no fear of the ordinary country-carts, with which they are familiar, and which they will allow to approach them to rather a short distance. Then the chetah is unhooded and slipped, and it makes for its familiar prey either springing towards it at once or else stealthily approaching it at first if the undulation of the ground allows it so to do. When it reaches the antelope it seizes it by the throat and holds it till the keepers come up. They cut the victim’s throat and give the chetah some of the blood in a bowl. Before he has finished lapping, his hood is slipped on again.

India contains, besides the striped hyæna, more than twenty kinds of animals allied either to the civet-cat or the mongoose; ten kinds of weasel, five species of badger, four sorts of otters, a kind of raccoon, four species of bear, and six or seven of wolves, jackals, and foxes.

Of the bears, the black species is more to be dreaded even than the tiger, very many natives and even some Europeans

having been killed or severely injured by them in the Himalayas. The brown bear is found from Afghanistan to Nepal, keeping to high elevations and living chiefly on the grassy slopes which extend above the forest region. They hybernate in winter, coming forth in March or April to feed on young leaves and sprouting herbage, or digging for roots or overturning stones in search of insects. They are very fond of fruit of all kinds; but, though such decided vegetarians, they will sometimes kill sheep or goats or even small bears, and they will feed on the bodies of animals they find dead.

A much more curious beast is the sloth bear, which ranges from the base of the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, though it is far less common (thanks to sportsmen) than it was thirty or forty years ago. Its long, coarse, shaggy fur, elongated mobile snout, short hind legs, and very comical antics, make it one of the most remarkable animals in India. It feeds on white ants, and on arriving at an ant-hill scratches away with its long, curved, powerful claws till it lays bare the large combs at the bottom of the nest, out of which it sucks the inhabitants in a very noisy manner. Wolves are found in India both in the open country and in forests. Mr. Blanford testifies that they will carry off children as well as sheep and goats, and that, when pressed by hunger, they will attack men. They will also combine to attack horses. The jackal's cry is familiar to all who have ever resided in India or any country inhabited by it, and it is found over the whole peninsula and in Ceylon. Its cry is commonly represented by Anglo-Indians as something like 'Dead Hindoo; where, where, where.'

Mr. Kipling says:—

'The jackal's chorus is so sudden and shrill and clamorous, so importunate and ear-filling, that one daily marvels at its equally sudden cessation. The air ought to go on vibrating with these parting yells, but it abruptly shuts down on them, still as a sleeping pond. And you resume your talk or work, but the creature with that one imprecation has sworn himself to hours of silence.' (P. 310.)

The dog has a bad time of it in India both from Hindus and Mahomedans. We say, 'Love me, love my dog,' but Mr. Kipling tells us the Orientals do not go so far; all they admit is that, if you are heart and soul devoted to a person, you may go to the extreme of taking her dog into your favour. They say, 'Even Leila's dog is dear to Majnau.' The homeless pariah dogs often attach themselves to a European who shows them—a thing to them otherwise un-

known—some kindness. But caste is as strict amongst Indian dogs as amongst Indian men, and the member of a strange society has a very warm reception from the society into which he ventures to intrude. The one ceremonial observance, or ritual, which concerns the dog is a practice of the Parsees only. When one of them is dying, or just dead, a dog is brought into the room, but the reason of this Mr. Kipling could not ascertain; the animal is more frequently eaten than is generally believed. It seems that the Sansis and other gipsy tribes eat dogs as well as lizards and rats.

The Indian beast, however, *par excellence*, the noblest, the largest, and the most characteristic of the country, is the elephant. This wonderful animal is still found wild along part of the base of the Himalayas, in the great forest country between the Ganges and Kistna, and in some of the forest-clad ranges of Mysore and further south, and in Ceylon. It also extends beyond our possessions into Siam, Cochin China, the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, and Borneo, though perhaps it was introduced by man into the last-named island. Elephants are essentially forest-loving beasts, although they will often enter the high grass growing on alluvial flats. Their herds usually number from thirty to fifty individuals, though sometimes they are more numerous, even amounting to 100. All the members of a herd are blood-relations except that stray females or young males may gain admission. The leader is invariably a female. Their food consists of grass, leaves, shoots of bamboo, plantains, and the twigs of fig, and each will consume from 600 to 700 pounds of green fodder daily. They drink before sunset and after sunrise; they rest during the heat of the day, and from an hour before midnight till very early in the morning. They are fond of bathing and rolling in the mud, and when on the tramp march in Indian file. They walk more or less quickly, generally only about a mile an hour; but it is impossible for them to gallop or make any kind of jump, though they can climb a hill very well and swim admirably, even for six hours without resting. Elephants will emit a shrill trumpeting sound or roar or squeak. At our Zoological Gardens a peculiar noise is often made by them which sounds like the pushing to of a heavy metal door. In captivity they rarely breed in India, although it is said that tame females often do so in Burma and Siam. They probably live 150 years in a wild state and over 100 years in captivity. When they attack they carry their vulnerable,

and to them supremely important, trunk tightly rolled up. The males charge with their tusks, and both sexes trample upon an enemy when caught.

Mr. Blanford agrees with Mr. Sanderson in considering that the intelligence of elephants has been greatly over-rated. They are inoffensive, timid, docile, and obedient animals; no other known beast, when adult, being so capable of domestication as is the elephant. It is this which has probably caused its intelligence to be rated too highly. The natives do not regard it as exceptionally intelligent; the fox, crow, and monkey being the animals they give credit to in this respect. In a manual of the late Mr. Steel, for the instruction of the commissariat and other departments, it is officially stated that while the elephant is 'obedient, gentle, 'and patient beyond measure,' it is also 'a decidedly stupid 'animal.'

Some of the native expressions of admiration for the elephant and their comparisons respecting it are, to us, rather surprising. Thus they say of an elegant woman that she has a 'waist like a lion and a gait like the elephant's. The creature itself has the most flattering names bestowed upon it, such as Pearl, Diamond, Necklace of Beauty, Lily, Rose, Silver Star, Golden One,' &c. It is also made the type of martial prowess, although it is naturally so timid that it is not ashamed to fly before a little dog. When frightened they become temporarily uncontrollable. When Raja Sahib drove his elephants with iron-clad brows to batter the gates of Arcot, as soon as they felt Clive's bullets they went raging back, trampling on their own masters. On the occasion of the great Imperial assemblage held at Delhi, a *feu de joie* followed the proclamation. This alarmed the elephants and so occasioned the death of several persons. It is not wonderful that the elephant is timid, for his trunk is very easily injured, and its importance to him is unspeakable. Without it he cannot live. When we remember this it becomes wonderful that these animals can be trained to face tigers in the way they will face them.

The very popular god Ganésa—patron of pilgrims and merchants, students and housewives—is represented with four arms and an elephant's head. His image, gaily painted, is to be found erected over the doorways of very many houses in India. The popular version of the divine origin of Ganésa is thus humorously told by Mr. Kipling :—

'During one of the absences of the great Lord [God] Shiva, Par-bati, his wife, taking a bath, rubbed some tiny pellets off her skin, and

amused herself by moulding them into the form of a child, till at last she breathed life into it. Shiva returned, and was outraged to find a baby where no baby should be, so he promptly cut off its head with his sharp war-quoit. Then Parvati explained, and Shiva said, in effect: "Dear me! this is very sad; why did not you speak sooner?" Then, catching sight of an elephant standing near, he cut off its head and clapped it on the decapitated baby. "Now, it's all right," said he; "I was always rather hasty." And, to make amends, he ordained that in every enterprise Ganésha's name should be the first called upon.' (P. 233.)

The popular name for a king is 'Elephant Lord,' and he is a special symbol of royalty. No poor man could maintain such a creature, since it costs from 4*l.* to 8*l.* a month, and involves many greater incidental expenses.

Essentially good-tempered as is the elephant, he used often to be made the public executioner, before British power extended over India. One which had so served died only a year or two ago. The Raja who formerly owned him liked to act as driver or 'mahout' on such occasions.

'The bound victim was handed to the elephant, who, at the word of command, seized him with his trunk and whirled him right and left against his forelegs, with the familiar action, peculiar to elephants, of swishing the dust from each wisp of provender before putting it into the mouth. Then he was thrown on the ground, and kicked from fore to hind feet to and fro, then his arms were wrenched from his body. Then the great feet came down upon him in turn, and at a final word he was knelt upon: the now lifeless body being crushed into a shapeless mass.'

The State-elephant of to-day has to be elaborately prepared for parade. The 'mahout,' with an assistant, first washes the huge animal and cleans it with a brick flesh-rubber. The creature plays during the process much as a child 'plays with the soap,' often blowing clouds of vapour from his trunk. Then his forehead, trunk, and ears are elaborately painted in bold colours. Then the howdah-pad is girthed on with cotton ropes.

'The howdah itself, a cumbrons frame of wood covered with beaten silver plates, is slung and tied with a purchase on the tail-root, and heavy cloths, brodered in raised work of gold and silver thread, are attached, hanging like altar cloths down the sides. A frontlet of gold and silver diaper, with fringes of fish-shaped ornaments in thin beaten silver, necklaces of large silver hawkbells and chain-work, with embossed heart-shaped pendants as big as the open hand, and hanging ornaments of chains of silver cartouches, are adjusted. A creating of silver ornaments, like small vases or fluted soup-tureens, exaggerations of the knobs along a horse's crest, descend from the rear of the howdah

to the tail, anklets of silver are sometimes fitted round the huge legs, and a bell is always slung at his side.'

Mr. Kipling relates many interesting anecdotes and gives us much valuable information about this most characteristic Indian animal, but we can afford no further space for citations with respect to it: we must pass on to other forms. To the camel eighteen valuable pages are devoted, but as this is only an Indian animal by adoption, we will here content ourselves by referring readers specially interested in the subject to his tenth chapter.

We cannot, however, pass by without notice those most sacred of Indian animals, the common domestic humped cattle of the country, though the origin of the race is unknown and it may have been an introduction from without. Mr. Kipling says, with perfect truth:—

'In Europe it is a half-forgotten legend that flocks and herds ranked first among early forms of wealth, and it is only in dissertations on the origin of money we are reminded that the root of "pecuniary" is *pecus*. But in agricultural and pastoral India, dependent on cattle for milk and labour, and on sheep and goats for flesh-meat, and kindred sayings, echoes of the now forgotten prayers of the Vedic hymns, repeat the ancient estimates of cattle. One of the first sensations of the tourist in India is the ubiquity of the bull, the cow, and the ox. . . . The people have a passion—no other word is strong enough—for the possession of cattle. Indian cities, full of folk, are also vast cow byres or mistals, and hitherto sanitary reform has not ventured to interfere. The cattle come and go at their own pleasure, and rub shoulders with humanity with an ineffable air of security and fellowship.' (P. 114.)

Not only is the cow a sacred animal firmly enthroned in the Hindu pantheon, but there is a strong tendency amongst the existing population to insist on it more than before and to denounce cow-killing in the strongest terms. This feeling, of course, tells much against us whose respect for roast beef is as well known as it is reprobated. It is a sin outweighing our many admitted benefactions. But if we are thus blamed, the native Mahomedans are much more so, not being, like us, outside strangers whose home is beyond the seven seas, and who therefore cannot be expected to know better. The cry which the Sikhs often raised against us before the annexation of the Punjab was that we defiled the country by the killing of cows, and it probably raised up enemies to us in that country, the Sikhs, in spite of other religious changes, having zealously preserved their reverence for the cow. The most terrible punishments in a future life are

declared by Brahmans to be the consequences of cow-killing, and very serious penances are imposed on those who have even accidentally caused the death of one of these animals. Nevertheless, Mr. Kipling informs us it is one of the commonest offences of rustic life. The leather-dressers, who belong to a low caste, think that it is not cow-murder to insert a skilfully poisoned thorn under the skin of a cow, or to drop poisoned food within its reach, and this although nothing would induce them to slaughter a cow unequivocally. This is so well understood that a village will pay black mail to the leather-dressers to save the lives of the cattle, solemnly pretending all the while that they are only propitiating certain gods.

The Hindus seem to think almost, if not quite, as much of the beauty of a cow as of its utility, and certainly the Indian bull possesses a very decided beauty. This is shown in its clean-cut legs, its fine expressive eye, its broad brow and slender muzzle, together with deep thin dewlap and smooth, mole-like skin. Its powers are as surprising to a freshly arrived European as its appearance, for it can jump a fence like a horse, holding its limbs, meanwhile, in similar fashion. It can also be trained to trot. The varieties of breed are very great, ranging in size from a very large ox to one not much bigger than Newfoundland dogs. These animals are the ordinary ones for vehicles; and the small hack carriages of Bombay, drawn by a pair of them, are remarkable for their neatness and cheapness as well as for their speed. Not only the passengers but the backs of the cattle also are protected by an awning.

The Brahminy cow, however, is never ridden, on account of its sanctity. Cattle are made to take part in various religious festivals, when they are adorned with necklaces of jessamine or of marigolds, and certain curious ceremonies attend milking. On each occasion the first emission should be allowed to fall to the earth as a libation, and, the first time a cow gives milk after calving, five such streams are thus dedicated to the Earth-goddess, who is a favourite object of worship. As the poor of most countries reverence food as a gift of God, it is natural that in Hindostan such reverence should be shown specially to milk. Mr. Kipling records various expressions indicating the value set upon it, such as 'Cow's milk is as mother's milk;' 'Milk and children are from fortune;' 'May you bathe in milk and rear many children,' &c. A Bengal saying, recalling the French 'When the cork is drawn the wine must be drunk,'

is 'Milk once drawn from the dug never goes back.' Boiled butter or 'ghi' is not less esteemed than milk, and is used as a symbol for prosperity, as when it is said of a man that 'He has five fingers in the ghi.' This reference to the hand indicates what is the fact as to its use:—

A Sikh peasant making you welcome will bring a bowl of milk . . . and, after he has put in some sugar, will stir it with his fingers in the most friendly way. One of the many compromises with the ordinances of caste, that make things pure or impure, is their relaxation with reference to sweetmeats compounded of sugar and ghi, an important part of the food of the people. The confectioner is a man of no very exalted caste, but all may eat from his hand. He abuses this privilege of reputed purity, and is in fact more dirty in his person and more thoroughly saturated with the grease he handles than there is any occasion for. One agent in the vast battery of elements that produces the characteristic Indian odour of Indian cities and crowds is the use of ghi as hair oil and as a lubricant for the skin after bathing. In the South, oil is much used for these purposes, but in most regions ghi is popular, nor is it unwholesome except to the alien nose.'

One curious and, for Englishmen, novel characteristic of Indian cattle is, their silence. They never 'low,' and the grunting noise they do make does not travel far. Used like horses as they are, it is not wonderful that they are often shod, two plates going to each foot. To be shod the ox is thrown down and has its feet tied together in a bunch.

The cow's value is much increased by the great scarcity of fuel in many parts of India. This has caused dried cow-dung to be a highly valued article for this purpose. The same product is used as a cement and as the finishing coat of a floor or wall of mud. The unpleasant odour rapidly passes away, 'leaving an undeniable impression of coolness, freshness, and, strange as it may seem, fragrance.'

Very different in appearance from these domestic cattle is the water-loving buffalo. Yet Mr. Kipling affirms that it is both more courageous and affectionate and that its milk is abundant as well as rich, while as a draught animal it has high qualities, save that it bears the sun badly and needs access to a pool or swamp. Though the Brahminy cow, as before said, is never ridden and the ox but seldom, the buffalo is constantly used as a steed.

Mr. Kipling's copious eighth chapter is entirely devoted to horses, and he abounds in interesting information as to their different breeds, training, and general treatment. It is sad to read that the horses of persons belonging to the upper classes are often killed by mistaken kindness or crippled by bad training, while ill-usage, overwork, and neglect are the

fate of those belonging to the lower. The high-class Indian trainer, left to himself, aims at producing artificial paces, air-fighting attitudes, wherewith necessarily goes a slow rate of speed. Many horses are fattened, like French fowls, by the grooms thrusting balls of food mixed with ghi, boiled goat's brains, and other rich messes down their throats. An exaggerated, unnatural curvature of the neck is produced by keeping the head tied tightly down and back for weeks at a time. The most murderous 'thorn bits' are also used. That ambling should be much prized, is one consequence of the Indian climate. Mr. Kipling well says:—

There are who ride and there are who sit on a horse and are carried. In a hot climate where for months the aim of life is to exist with as little motion as possible, since heat is a mode of motion, and you are already many degrees hotter than you like, it is natural that equestrian India should prefer to sit on a horse. Ambling is the easiest way of doing this. You shall see at a cold weather fête, or public function, a burly native inspector of police bumping vigorously in his saddle . . . But see that same inspector in the hot weather, faring to a village away from his district superintendent's observation. His legs dangle carelessly, his body, languidly thrown back, has just as much movement as a jelly on a footman's tray, while a constable on each side supports him as they run alongside his lazily ambling charger. When he halts they reverently lift him down, and, placing him on a bed under a village tree or in a verandah, undress and shampoo him tenderly, while another prepares his *hūgga*, and the village elders stand before him with joined hands to learn his lordship's commands during dinner. The sun is in fact master of the situation, and his dictates are obeyed in riding as in other matters.' (P. 193.)

The characteristic, all-pervading horse of the hot plains is the *tattoo*, or country pony, which has great pluck and endurance.

In India, English turf men appear in a new character, that of veritable missionaries! Speed cannot be produced with the conditions existing amongst native, unimproved trainers, and thus it comes about that sport and polo serve to disseminate a gospel of good treatment for the most noble of four-footed beasts.

Horses take a great part in most Indian weddings. Both Hindu and Muhammadan bridegrooms ride in procession, while the bride is borne in a canopied litter. . . The equestrian marriage parade is probably an ancient custom based, it may be, on the marriage by capture of which we hear so much. In Western India the bridegroom rides, covered with tinsel and gay clothing, in the midst of a moving square of artificial flowers and bushes, counterfeiting a garden, borne on long platforms on the heads of coolies. In the case of the trading Hindus of the cities this ride is often the first and last occasion of crossing a

horse. The child bridegroom begins his progress with a light heart, but the weight of his finery, the smoke of the torches, the din of the throbbing, screaming music, and the ceaseless clamour soon tell, and you may see the poor little man crying as he is held in the saddle, or lifted off, half dead with sleep, and put into a litter.'

The ass is very badly treated and greatly disesteemed, and Indians have a practice of slitting its nostrils to mitigate its voice, though the measure is utterly inefficacious. It is associated with Sitala, the dread goddess of the smallpox, whose worship seems to be confined to women and children, who flock to her shrine, and sometimes, to propitiate her, throw a few grains of pulse to her steed, the ass. His name is, as in Europe, a reproach. When a fool is praised by a fool they say, 'Ass scratches ass.' But although the animal is despised, its milk is valued and deemed, as it is, an important medicine. Superstition also occasionally serves him. In some regions the donkey enjoys a moment's honour as the steed of Sitala; for a bridegroom about to start in the marriage procession will mount an ass for an instant, as a propitiation to the dread goddess. But its life is one long martyrdom to the stick, and it is shamefully abandoned to starve and die when his strength fails.

There is a true wild ass which is common in Ladak, and a few occur in Baluchistan, especially on the Punjab frontier.† They inhabit semi-desert plains, in herds numbering from four to forty, and sometimes in much larger numbers; they feed on grasses, green or dry, and are renowned for their speed. In the Runn of Cutch some adults have been overtaken by men on horseback and speared. But these Mr. Blanford believes to have been mares in foal.

The wild oxen of India consist, besides the buffalo, of the gaur, the gayal, the bunting, and the yak. The last-named animal, so celebrated for the very copious hair of its tail, lives on the plateau of Tibet at an elevation, in summer, of from 14,000 to 20,000 feet. It is only found within Indian limits in northern Ladak. They are domesticated by the Tibetans, and breed freely with domestic cattle. The wild yaks inhabit the coldest, wildest, and most desolate mountains, and are found at a greater elevation than any other beast, and in winter will eat snow. Wild buffaloes are wanting in Southern and Western India, though they abound in Northern Ceylon.

The Indian fauna comprises a dozen kinds of wild sheep or goats, amongst which are the Himalayan ibex and the Markhor, which is the grandest of all wild goats. The

elegant Nilgai, or Blue-bull, with its short horns, is found widely in India, though it does not extend so far east as Eastern Bengal, nor westwards as far as the Indus, nor in Ceylon. They are easily tamed, and have been taught to draw light carriages. Few sportsmen care about shooting them, and they are generally protected by Hindoos, who regard them, as their name implies, as a sort of cow. There are half-a-dozen species of Indian antelopes, and amongst them three gazelles, as to the best known of which, Mr. Blanford says, it

'is commonly seen in small parties of from two to six, though I have found from ten to twenty associating in a herd. It keeps much to waste ground, especially where that is broken up by ravines, but it is seldom seen on alluvial plains, and it haunts cultivation less than the antelope. It is frequently found amongst scattered bushes or thin tree-jungle, and may be met with on undulating ground, even on the top of hills; it is commonly found amongst sand-hills, and is nowhere so abundant as in parts of the Indian desert. It lives on grass and the leaves of bushes, and, I believe, never drinks, for it is common in tracts where there is no water except from deep wells; and although I was on the look out for some years, and saw the tracks of almost every common wild animal at the pools in stream-beds, the only waters remaining in many places in the hot season, I never saw the easily recognised prints of the gazelle's hoofs. It is, however, fond of the green grass near water.' (P. 527.)

Its flesh is excellent, but the animal is very swift and can rarely be caught by dogs.

India also possesses half-a-dozen species of deer—the spotted deer (or *Axis*), the Bâmbâr deer (or *Rusa*) and the Hog deer being amongst the number. The *Axis* is perhaps the most elegant of all deer, and its favourite haunts are in some of the most beautiful wild scenery of the lower hills, on the margins of rippling streams, for, unlike the gazelle, it is never far from water. It is found throughout almost the whole of India and in Ceylon, and will ascend to a height of 6,000 feet. A wild creature of much economic value is the Musk deer, which has no horns, but a pair of long tusks on the upper jaw. It is found in the Himalayas at elevations between 8,000 and 12,000 feet. It is a solitary animal which frequents wooded slopes, and is very sure-footed. The musk it produces is a soft brown substance which is developed in an abdominal gland at the rutting season. About an ounce is the average produce of one animal. The creatures are shot or snared in nooses, and in spite of the odour their flesh is excellent and quite free from any musky taste.

There is a small hornless creature, with tusks in the upper jaw, which is also often spoken of as a musk deer, though it has little real affinity to that animal. This is the *Indian Chevrotain*, or *mouse deer*. Its height at the shoulder is one foot at the most, while from the snout to the root of its short tail it only measures from 18 to 22 inches. It is a gentle timid little creature, easily domesticated, which walks about on the tips of its small hoofs towards nightfall. This animal is thus but seldom seen, especially as it keeps amongst rocks, in crevices of which it passes the heat of the day. It is found in Ceylon and in Southern and East Central India, and in the Western Gháts north of Bombay. Two other species inhabit the Malay peninsula.

As everyone knows, there is a wild boar in India; but there is also—in Nepál, Sikhim, and Bhután—a diminutive wild pig, little more than two feet long from snout to root of tail. Some specimens of the elegant little beast were exhibited a short time ago at our Zoological Gardens. The tame pig of India is no doubt derived from the wild boar, and probably sometimes breeds with it, for Mr. Blanford records (p. 561) having more than once seen a litter of tame pigs which were striped, and as this is not generally the case with tame animals, their sire may very probably have been a wild boar. The Hindoos appear to have unconsciously acquired from their Mahomedan invaders a feeling of disgust for the pig. Nevertheless they enjoy hunting the wild boar, and his flesh has always been enjoyed by Rajput nobles and Sikh chiefs.

Mr. Kipling tells us that

‘some Europeans have tried to breed and feed pigs in the Western fashion, and not without success. Others have imported stock from Europe, but not all the dollars in Chicago will avail to prove the industry respectable in native eyes for many a year to come.

‘But there is nothing to be ashamed of in the character and conduct of wild pigs. They cut for themselves shelters from the sugar-cane or the tall millet stocks, where they breed and sleep, take the best of the crops, and defy mankind. The wild boar has been known to face and defeat the tiger, and, though his first impulse is to fly before British sportsmen, he often makes a gallant stand before the unequal odds of horses, razor-sharp spears, and legions of yelling rustics brought against him. No swordsman can cut right and left so swiftly and surely as the wild boar with his tusks when fighting for life. He is sometimes shot by Rajput chiefs, by whom he is as strictly preserved as the fox in England. This protection breeds boldness. My son tells me that he was once shown a lane in a suburb of a Rajput town, along which a certain well-known wild boar was accustomed to pass

at dawn. The animal was next day shot by the ruler of the State, and a side of bacon was despatched by special messenger on a camel as a gift to a brother prince some hundred miles away. The Maharaja took just as much interest in pointing out the course of his bullet as a European sportsman who has brought down a stag, and expressed as cordial an appreciation of the quality of the flesh as if it were venison. And yet we are constantly told that all Hindus are strictly vegetarian !' (P. 180.)

Before bidding adieu to the four-footed beasts of India a word must be said about the rhinoceros, of which there are three species. The common species is now almost restricted to the Assam plains, though twenty or thirty years ago it was still common in the Sikhim Terai.* In the time of the Emperor Baber (1505-1530) it was common in the Punjab. It inhabits the grass jungles that cover so much of the uncultivated parts of the North Indian plains, and has a preference for swampy ground. It is a quiet and inoffensive animal until wounded. A smaller species is found in Eastern Bengal and Burma. The third species, which is distinguished by having two horns, we can only lay claim to because it is found in Assam, though it is rare even there. Thence it extends to Siam, the Malay peninsula, Sumatra, and Borneo.

A few notes on those remarkable inhabitants of the air, the bats, may serve to terminate our notice of Indian mammals. There are not less than ninety distinct kinds of bats in India, whereof about a dozen belong to that group of large fruit-eating bats known as *flying foxes*. As to these leathern-winged jackals of the air Mr. Kipling speaks as follows :—

'The large fruit-eating bat or flying fox is a noble creature, looming largest, perhaps, when in the still breathless evenings he beats his noiseless way high over the wan waters of Bombay harbour or the adjacent creeks, dark against a sky in which there lingers a lurid flush of crimson and orange. The lowest castes eat flying-foxes, which are probably of excellent flavour, seeing that they grow fat on the best of the fruit. They are regularly eaten in the Malay Archipelago, and Mr. Wallace says that when properly dressed they have no offensive fumes, and taste like hare. I once kept one, but he could scarcely be called an amusing pet, his strong point being his enormous appetite for bananas. On one occasion he escaped, and began to fly away, but promptly came back, for he was mobbed by flights of crows, who had never seen such a creature before. Crows go early to bed, and the appearance of this monster bat in their own

* Blanford, *op. cit.* p. 473.

daylight seemed to be an outrage on their rights and feelings. So they chivied him—if I may be allowed the expression—much as the street boys are said to have chivied Jonas Hanway when he appeared in London streets with the first umbrella. The flying-fox was in a great fright, knowing that a single stroke of a crow's beak would ruin the membrane of his vans, more delicate than any silk ever stretched on a "paragon" frame. In pairing time flying-foxes are lively all day, though they do not fly abroad, and the trees in which they hang in great reefs and clusters are so noisy with their quarrelling, screaming, or fighting as to be a serious nuisance to a quiet village.' (P. 59.)

The powers of flight of these bats are very great.* One is recorded to have been taken at sea alive, though tired, at a distance of two hundred miles from the nearest land. One species is so large that the expanse of its wings measures five feet.

India possesses a true vampire (*Megaderma*) which ranges from Kashmir to Cape Comorin and Ceylon. Its vampire habit has been fully ascertained by that well-known Indian naturalist the late Mr. Blyth, who actually succeeded in capturing a specimen in the very act of sucking the blood of an individual belonging to a smaller species of the bat tribe. He sucked it while flying with his victim, which he afterwards devoured. Mr. Blyth's statement,* which seems to us well worth quoting, is as follows:—

'Chancing one evening to observe a rather large bat enter an outhouse, from which there was no other egress than by the doorway, I was fortunate in being able to procure a light, and thus to proceed to the capture of the animal. Upon finding itself pursued, it took three or four turns round the apartment, when down dropped what at the moment I supposed to be its young, and which I deposited in my handkerchief. After a somewhat tedious chase, I then secured the object of my pursuit, which proved to be a fine female megaderma. I then looked to the other bat which I had picked up, and, to my considerable surprise, found it to be a small kind of pipistrelle, which is exceedingly abundant throughout India. The individual now referred to was feeble from loss of blood, which it was evident the megaderma had been sucking from a large and still bleeding wound under and behind the ear, and the very obviously suctorial form of the mouth of the megaderma was itself sufficient to hint the strong probability of such being the case. During the very short time that elapsed before I entered the outhouse it did not appear that the depredator had once alighted; and I am satisfied that it sucked the vital fluid from its victim as it flew, having probably seized it on the wing, and that it was seeking a quiet nook where it might devour the body at leisure. I kept both animals separate till next morning, when, procuring a con-

* In the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. xi. p. 255.

venient cage, I first put in the megaderma, and after observing it for some time, I placed the pipistrelle with it. No sooner was the latter perceived than the other fastened upon it with the ferocity of a tiger, again seizing it behind the ear, and made several efforts to fly off with it; but finding it must needs stay within the precincts of the cage, it soon hung by the hind legs to one side of its prison, and, after sucking its victim till no more blood was left, commenced devouring it, and soon left nothing but the head and some portions of the limbs.

The subject of Indian ornithology is not one to enter upon towards the close of our article. It would rather demand an article to itself, especially since the lovers of ornithology form so great a proportion of the whole body of naturalists, as well as of unlearned lovers of Nature, her ways and products. Therefore we shall here confine ourselves to a brief expression of our admiration for the two volumes which Mr. Oates has produced, as well as of our regret that his recall to India did not permit him to complete his attractive work, to him evidently a labour of love. But though Mr. Oates has been compelled to leave his description of the birds of India incomplete, he has none the less entirely completed the far most important section of the whole class—the section known to naturalists as Passerine birds, which includes all our songsters, our tits, our starlings, our crows, our kingfishers, our swallows, and many more. This section is more numerous than are all other orders of birds put together. It is also the group which affords the greatest difficulties of identification and classification, and Indian ornithologists may be heartily congratulated on the appearance of its second volume, which took place towards the close of 1890.

Neither shall we enter upon the vast subject of Indian fishes, the volumes about which we owe to the patience and learning of the late Mr. Francis Day, too soon cut off from science and his many friends by the terrible disease which closed his sadly abbreviated career.

The reptiles of India, however, must occupy us for a brief space. These are admirably described by the accomplished young naturalist M. Boulenger, who brings down to the present day work which had previously been undertaken and excellently done, as far as means then admitted, by Dr. Günther, F.R.S. His work (published by the Ray Society in 1864) was admirably illustrated by that incomparable delineator of reptilian life the late Mr. Ford. The amount of scientific advance made since the publication of Dr. Günther's folio may be estimated by a comparison of

the number of species described respectively by Dr. Günther in 1864 and by M. Boulenger in 1890. Of tortoises and turtles there were described 30 kinds, now 43; of lizards, formerly 95 kinds, now 225; of snakes in 1864, 180 kinds, now 264; of frogs and toads, by Dr. Günther 37 kinds, by M. Boulenger 124. The need of a new work is therefore manifest.

The zoological contrast which exists between our Oriental Empire and regions more northerly is shown by the almost entire absence of efts or newts from Hindostan. Indeed, twenty-one years ago they were deemed entirely absent, as it was only in 1871 that the single species known was first described by Dr. Anderson.* It exists in Sikhim, but was first found by its discoverer in the flooded ricefields about the little Chinese town of Nantin, where, however, it was not very common. In the more elevated valleys of Momien and Hotha, at nearly 5,000 feet above the sea, it was far from uncommon. This fact is interesting as showing the creature, which is so peculiar as to constitute by itself a new genus,† is an immigrant from the north. The order of efts, which is a considerably numerous one, has indeed its headquarters in the western part of the northern hemisphere—namely, in the United States of America—but a good number of species exist in Europe and North Asia. Thence a few species extend southwards along mountain regions; and this is the case with our solitary Indian eft, as also with another species which descends along the mountains of Siam. It is interesting to note that this latter species is closely allied to American forms, as also is the giant of the order, the great salamander of China and Japan. Efts constitute one order of batrachians, as frogs and toads constitute another. A third order consists of creatures which ordinary observers would never suspect to be batrachians at all, since they have very much the appearance of earth-worms, and might, if not taken for that, be supposed to be some kind of worm-like snake.

They are, however, true batrachians, and five species are described by M. Boulenger as denizens of India. They are burrowing creatures and are usually found in damp situations. They lay large eggs, which they deposit in a burrow near the water, and the female protects them by coiling herself round the mass.

* In the Proceedings of the Zoological Society for 1871, p. 493.

† *Tylototriton*.

India contains two species of crocodile, one of which is found from Baluchistan to Burma and Ceylon. The largest specimen of this kind in the British Museum is twelve feet long, though it is said to grow much larger. This reptile is found in rivers, marshes, and ponds. The other kind, which appears to frequent only the tideway of rivers, has been recorded (p. 4) as attaining a length of thirty-three feet. It has a very extensive range over the earth's surface, as it is found not only in India, Ceylon, and Burma, but from Southern China to North Australia and the Solomon and Fiji Islands. Besides these crocodiles, India is the home of the Gavial, or Gharial, which attains a length of twenty feet, and feeds entirely upon fish. It is found in the Indus, the Ganges, and the Brahmaputra rivers, and their larger tributaries. It is interesting as being related to certain allied kinds which are only known as fossils. Crocodiles are occasionally regarded as sacred, but not kept or periodically fed.

The most important of the reptiles of India in relation to man are the serpents, of which M. Boulenger describes no less than sixty-nine kinds, which are more or less poisonous. The more deadly of these are the Cobra, the Hamadryad, the Krait, Russell's viper, and the Echis. The great mortality annually occasioned by snake-bite in India makes the Indian Government exceedingly anxious for their destruction, and has caused it to offer premiums for this purpose. During the past eleven years no less than 20,000*l.* has been thus spent, and yet, over the greater part of India, the deaths from this cause are rather increasing than diminishing. There are two obstacles which work against all the best efforts of the Government. The first of these is the superstition of the Hindoo population; the second is that the very bestowal of rewards induces the outcaste jungle folk to breed and rear snakes. It is only in Bengal, according to Mr. Kipling (p. 348), that their destruction is really effective, and that the number of deaths from snake-bite is decreasing. Native officers are being directed by the Sanitary Board of each province to destroy cover for snakes near villages. But the natives like to have about their villages thickets of thorn and prickly pear, jungle growth, and clumps of tall reeds, as well as noisome ponds of drinking-water; and Mr. Kipling tells us forcibly as briefly that 'the average native hates sanitation as the devil hates holy water, and worse.' The serpent is widely revered in India, takes part in a thousand tales of mystery and wonder, and is credited with superhuman wisdom and wickedness.

Mr. Kipling avers that

'The worship of the serpent may not everywhere survive in official form, and there are, I believe, no temples entirely consecrated to Nāgas; but it is still practised as a domestic ordinance in Southern India, and everywhere the true Hindu reverences the fateful creature that carries pure death in its fangs. *Sarpa homa* is the name given to the somewhat elaborate ceremony of snake-worship. But in everyday life, when the women of a household hear a cobra chasing rats or mice in the ceiling or roof, they will pause in their work and put their hands together in silent adoration.' (P. 342.)

He also tells us that they believe serpents to be animated by the souls of deceased persons, and that on this account they will watch over and protect cattle, for this receiving the regular worship their actions merit. A cultivator's wife, seeing a snake, will sometimes say what is equivalent to 'Oh dear! I have forgotten his dues,' and will make offerings of milk and curds with quaint formalities.

It is a modern Italian superstition that snakes guard treasure, and amongst the many serpent tales of India there are several which refer to this idea. One such is of a princess, whose husband has swallowed a snake. They go on a journey in search of a remedy, and while she is anxiously watching him asleep, she sees the snake come out of his mouth and talk to another snake, a guardian of treasure, revealing the spell which can subdue. Thus she learns how at once to cure her husband and endow him with illimitable wealth. This story reminds our author of one told by Gerald of Barri concerning a young man grievously afflicted from having swallowed an adder, who went in vain to all the shrines in England for relief, which he only obtained in Ireland, where no snake can live.

Lamia stories are common in India, and Mr. Kipling tells the following one :—

'A peasant meets a lovely disconsolate woman in the woods, brings her home, and makes her his wife. A holy man passes that way, and repays his entertainment by instructing the peasant how to detect and destroy the monster woman-snake.

'So the now suspicious husband prepares for dinner a salt curry, having previously broken the drinking-water vessels. As he lies by her side, pretending to sleep, her beautiful head rises from the pillow, the neck slowly, slowly lengthens, the forked tongue plays in feverish thirst as the serpent curves and twines round the hut seeking the door. Then, with sinuous stretch, it glides out and away, and he hears the lapping of water on the distant river-brink, while the fair body by his side is cold and still. Then it returns, coil on coil shortening and settling noiselessly down, until at last a lovely woman's head is laid on

the pillow with a soft sigh of content. The next day, while his industrious and beautiful wife is busy at the oven outside, the peasant thrusts her into its glowing depth, and piles on wood till she is utterly consumed, even as the holy man instructed him.' (P. 341.)

As we have already said, serpents are thought to protect cattle, and this belief, of course, protects them. There is also another reason which makes many Hindoos indisposed to destroy them, namely, the tedious consequences which their ritual in such a case prescribes. Decrees not yet obsolete ordain that when a snake is killed the Hindoo shall perform mourning ceremonies like those he would have to perform in honour of a dead relation. In fact, Hindoos in general are as anxious to propitiate a poisonous snake as we are to destroy it. But though they see so much of snakes their observations concerning them and other animals are curiously mistaken. Thus, if they see a snake with a muskrat in its mouth, they imagine him to be in a terrible dilemma. If he swallows the musk-rat they think it will destroy his sight; and if he rejects it they think that will make him a leper. There is only one escape for him, and that is to go into the water. Really the snake is, of course, no whit the worse for his, to us unsavoury, meal. Again, nothing can persuade the natives but that the mongoose knows of a remedy for snake-bite. They think it is some plant they do not know, which, when eaten, is so effective an antidote that it gives to the very breath of a mongoose which has partaken of it a power to paralyse a snake. Really, however, the mongoose only escapes the serpent's poison by the wonderful quickness and adroitness of its movements. This same mongoose is a very attractive little animal, for hardly any other wild animal takes so readily to domestic life :—

'First coming into the house through the bath-water exits, in chase of snake or rat, and ending, with a little encouragement, by stealing into the master's chair, and passing a quite inquisitive nose under his arm to examine a cup of tea held in his hand.' (P. 351.)

The mongoose, as a dexterous manœuvrer with snakes, naturally leads us on to the consideration of the snake-charmer, who also really possesses no charm but nimbleness and manual dexterity. He will often pretend to be able to charm and draw a wild snake out of a hole into which his own hand has previously placed one of his own. Mr. Kipling takes occasion from this fact to make a sly remark at the expense of delusions existing nearer home. He observes :—

'A fair theosophist, describing the conditions under which the early miracles of her curious creed were wrought, declared in print that for their due performance it was necessary that the miracle-workers should "know the place, and have been there, the more recently the better." If this be true of discovered brooches, broken tea-cups, or cigarette papers, it is also true of cobras. All the snake-charmer asks is to know the place, and to have been there recently, and you shall have your snake without fail. But there are theosophists who declare that in watching a snake-charmer's tricks we are witnessing manifestations of occult mysteries. "Then is the moon of ripe green cheese compact." (P. 352.)

But confidence in a preternatural influence is certainly often felt by the pretender himself, sometimes with serious consequences to him. Mr. Kipling records the case of a Mussulman faquir who, when visiting the beast-garden at Lahore, deliberately put his arm through the bars of the cage in which a native tiger called 'Moti' was confined. Instead of receiving, as he probably expected, reverence from the animal, it seized upon his arm, and, before the poor man could be dragged away, it was torn from the socket. After three days' suffering, borne serenely by the devotee, he expired. The very same animal, however, escaped on an occasion from its den, but it allowed its keeper to tie his turban round its neck and lead it back to its den.

The popular superstition, still firmly rooted in India, that some men and women can assume the form of animals, is often applied to the tiger to account for some 'man-eater' of unusual bloodthirstiness. One such tale is thus given by our author:—

'Once upon a time the tiger was a man, who by traffic with demons had acquired a charm which enabled him to change to a tiger. His wife, being as curious as the rest of the daughters of Eve, begged to be allowed to witness the transformation. Very reluctantly he consented, and entrusted her with a magic root to be given to him to restore him to his real estate. But when the tiger appeared before her, the poor woman lost her head and ran away in terror, and, before she could recover, the villagers saw him and set out in chase. She never had another chance of meeting her husband. So she died of grief, and he, in rage and despair, revenged himself on humanity at large. Tales of this kind should be told, as in India, in the evening shadows under the village pipal tree, suggesting whispering of ghostland overhead, while the vast background of the outer dark beckons the fancy to a far travel. Under these circumstances, the absurdity of animal transformation assumed a dignity and reasonableness impossible to convey in print.' (P. 399.)

Mr. Kipling's sixteenth chapter is devoted to a most interesting account of the treatment of animals in Indian

art. It is architectural art alone, he tells us, which can lay claim to the highest distinction in India. Its plastic art which, when at its best, was inferior to that of other countries, has greatly deteriorated in modern times. It is a curious instance of the survival of religious faith co-existing with the decay of religious art. On Sanchi topes and in the Ajanta caves there are figures of animals far superior to any which are now produced, and nothing can exceed the freedom and facility with which elephants are drawn and painted there. In modern work, on the other hand, every detail is treated in a conventional manner, the ears being fluted as regularly as scallop shells. The plastic instinct was no doubt much repressed through Mahomedan influence; yet, as this influence came from Persia, which never considered itself bound by the Mussulman law in this respect, its repressive influence must have been the less on that account.

We must now reluctantly terminate our notice of a charming work which, though not expressly intended to serve the cause of natural science, cannot fail so to do, by the interest in animal life its perusal must excite. Such persons as may thus be moved to pay attention to and begin to study the zoology of Hindostan, will find in the carefully executed volumes of the official 'Fauna of British India' the best possible aid to help them along the path which Mr. Kipling has induced them to enter upon. But it is not the study of animal life alone which his work will promote. It cannot but benefit that native population which he has so long and so sympathetically studied, by the many valuable hints and suggestions for their benefit its agreeable pages contain. We have now but to express our sincere thanks to him and to the authors, and especially to the editor of the admirable volumes with which the Council and Secretary of State for India have enriched the literature of zoological science.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Government of London.* By the Right Hon. SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P. (Chairman of the London County Council). ‘The Fortnightly Review,’ February 1892.

2. *The London County Council:* (1) *Towards a Commune.* By JOHN BURNS, L.C.C. (2) *Towards Common Sense.* By R. E. PROTHERO. ‘The Nineteenth Century,’ March 1892.

3. *The London County Council:* (1) *The Impeachment.* By T. G. FARDELL. (2) *The Defence.* By CHARLES HARRISON. ‘The New Review,’ March 1892.

4. *The London Programme.* By SIDNEY WEBB. London: 1892.

ALL Londoners, and, indeed, all Englishmen, have, in theory at any rate, a common desire in regard to the municipal government of the metropolis. They want an administration which shall secure efficiency, economy, and responsibility. In other words, there is a general agreement that the local body which administers the affairs of the Capital should do whatever work it undertakes in the best way possible; should do it also in the way least burdensome to the ratepayer, and, further, should be capable of being made answerable for its conduct to the community at large. Now it is obvious that efficiency, economy, and responsibility are primarily matters of machinery. No body of men, however virtuous and however well-intentioned, will govern London successfully if the machinery with which they attempt the task is defective. It is, then, in no way impertinent to choose the present moment for asking the question, Is London provided with administrative machinery suitable to its needs? A new Council has just been elected, and those who supported as well as those who opposed the party which finds itself in a majority are anxious that the government of the metropolis should be put upon a satisfactory basis. We venture to assert that nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the existing arrangements, and that, if the new Council are well advised, they will without delay address themselves to the task of remodelling the scheme of administration which they will find in operation. It is possible that, to perfect such a work, they may need to apply to the Legislature; but even without an amendment of the Local Government Act, 1888, they may be able to do a great deal in the way of reform.

The arrangements under which London is at present governed are utterly unsuited to a nation of wellnigh five million citizens. The administrative constitution of the capital might be applicable to a village; it cannot but be out of place in the case of so vast a concourse of human beings. When a civilised or semi-civilised community begin to feel the need of joint action in regard to their local affairs, their natural impulse is to select a committee to which, under various names, is entrusted the management of the common business of the town or district. Not only the history of primitive institutions, but that of newly settled countries in modern times, affords plenty of examples of the spontaneous generation of this the simplest form of municipal life. In ordinary cases this committee administration, overlaid with a certain amount of ornament in the way of mayors and other civic officers, and strengthened by wont and usage, is found sufficient. When the affairs of a city become too numerous and too complicated to be managed by a single board, it is possible to divide the committee into sub-committees and to delegate to these fractions of the whole the supervision of particular portions of the work. But though this provision for the needs of local government may be sufficient even in cities of very considerable size, it is easy to see that the wider the area and the greater the population placed under a system of what, for want of a more convenient term, we must call committee government, the harder becomes the task of securing efficiency, economy, and responsibility. A committee of fifty or so may be able to administer the affairs of Birmingham with success; one of one hundred and thirty-seven may fail in the far more complicated task of managing the local concerns of the five million people who constitute the administrative county of London. It is obvious that it cannot be either necessary or useful to inquire what is the exact point at which municipal government by a committee becomes impracticable. To make such an inquiry would prove as unprofitable as an attempt to determine the exact number of straws which break the camel's back.

It is enough to know that the attempt to govern London by means of a committee of one hundred and thirty-seven persons is fraught with the gravest possible inconvenience. The scheme of the Local Government Act of 1888 is for London nothing less than administration by public meeting, and it was only by means of the most careful manipulation that a complete breakdown of the machinery did not take

place during the past three years. The first County Council for London only avoided administrative shipwreck by splitting itself into a multitude of sub-committees to which special duties were assigned, and in moments of difficulty by placing itself unreservedly in the hands of such skilful pilots as Lord Rosebery and Sir John Lubbock. It is true that by the multiplication of sub-committees all sense of responsibility and of coherence of policy was lost; but these results, bad as they are, were better than the alternative of administrative collapse. You may conduct the work of civic administration by a board of thirty, though, as experience shows, the task is not easy; but actual administration by a board of one hundred and thirty-seven is utterly impossible. The new County Council for London must, then, do one of two things: either it must adopt the system pursued by the late Council, or it must face the whole problem of administration by boards and construct a totally new administrative machinery. That it will adopt the second alternative is our earnest hope, for we are convinced that the system pursued by the first Council cannot possibly continue without proving the cause of grave evils to the metropolis.

To make good a case against the arrangements adopted by the late Council is not difficult. It stands universally condemned, for even those who approve of the general results achieved by the Council regret the friction and waste of energy required to bring them about. Sir John Lubbock has given in an article in the February number of the 'Fortnightly Review' an account of how the system worked. There were some nineteen committees, and every councillor, it was decided, must be placed on at least one committee.

'Just fancy,' says Sir John Lubbock, 'the result if a similar course were adopted in Parliament. Either the army, navy, and other departments would be managed by committees each consisting of some Conservatives, English Home Rulers, Irish Home Rulers, and Unionist Liberals in their respective proportions, or some departments would be entrusted to Conservatives, some to Home Rule Liberals, some to Liberal Unionists, some to English Home Rulers, some to Irish Home Rulers. It is obvious that such a system could not possibly work well, probably not at all. Now in the London County Council we have staunch Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, and Socialists—men differing quite as much as the different sections in the House of Commons, men of great ability, and earnestly believing in the absolute truth of their own convictions—and nothing but great good temper and much mutual forbearance would have enabled us to get through our work at all.'

In a word, if we tried to administer the affairs of the United Kingdom as we do those of London, we should have,

instead of a ministry, fifteen or sixteen hybrid committees administering, respectively, the War Office, the Admiralty, the Local Government Office, and the other departments of State. Each of them would report once a week to the House of Commons, and receive their orders, and each would have to obtain confirmation for every administrative act by a vote of the whole House. Sir John Lubbock gives yet another example of the extraordinary cumbrousness of the London system. 'While,' he says, 'in our national affairs the appointments are made by the departments, in our London government they are decided—even down to the promotion or dismissal of a fireman, or the appointment of a door-keeper, every resolution to make a new path in one of the parks, to open a doorway on to a park, to put up a lodge or a shed, to renew turf, to purchase gravel or iron hurdles, every question of wages or hours of work—by the whole Council. So numerous are these details, which it would be impossible to enumerate here, that we have many more than a hundred resolutions to deal with at every weekly meeting of the Council. They come to us, no doubt, after having been carefully considered by the respective committees, and the Council wisely but seldom interferes with details. Still, it is obvious that the system renders it very difficult to fix responsibility, and offers almost unlimited facilities for obstruction. I must confess that I have often had great misgivings whether under such a system it would be possible to get through the business at all.'

In noticing the difficulty of fixing responsibility, Sir John Lubbock brings forward one of the strongest objections to the sub-committee system. Unless we can make those we entrust with the duties of administration feel that they are answerable to the community whose affairs they manage, we shall never obtain a satisfactory scheme of local government. At present all responsibility is frittered away among the members of the various committees. No doubt it is a technically correct answer to say that the committee—i.e. all its members, severally and collectively—is responsible for its acts, but in practice this responsibility is worthless. To make responsibility an effective instrument of good administration, it must be connected with a visible personality, as it is in the case of Imperial affairs. If the national finances are mismanaged, there is a visible, tangible person on whom to visit the consequences—the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If the resources of London are wasted, we can only lament the folly of a finance committee, whose

members are able to shuffle off the responsibility of each on all. Both the ratepayers and those who constitute the committees are demoralised by this knowledge that it is practically impossible to fix responsibility for the details of London administration upon any one person. The ratepayers give up all hope of making their local rulers answerable for their misdeeds, and the local rulers feel that even if things are mismanaged little or no blame can be attached to them individually.

Another of the causes which militate against the efficiency of administration by committees or boards, popularly elected at short intervals, is their fluctuating character. Three years are but a short time for a man to acquire complete knowledge of the details of a complicated administrative department. He comes into office without traditions, embarrassed perhaps by the acts or engagements of his predecessors. Yet it is probable that at least half the members of a newly elected Council will be novices, and when they have learned their business they will be succeeded in three years by other novices as ignorant as they originally were themselves. This inconvenience or danger, which is fatal to any systematic policy of administration, may be remedied by the existence of a strong substructure of permanent officers, who become by long experience the most efficient agents of each department. Take the example of the Corporation of the City of London; whose steady and judicious administration of municipal affairs contrasts very favourably with the eccentricities of the County Council, because it is carried on by magistrates generally elected for life, and by officers who know the traditional duties of their position. Take again the constitution and action of the innumerable boards of directors of railroads, waterworks, docks, gas companies, insurance companies, &c., whose functions consist mainly in the selection and control of competent agents and an efficient staff of experts and specialists. Take, above all, the example of the administrative departments of the Imperial Government, which is an employer of labour and a director of public works, in the dockyards, the arsenals, the national buildings and the domain of the Crown, enormously greater than that of any municipal body. Does anyone doubt that it is the duty of the Government to take care that these works are cheaply, honestly, and efficiently performed, without raising the market price of labour, and without tolerating inferior workmanship?

These results are obtained mainly by a numerous and powerful body of civil servants, on whom the practical management of details devolves. Administration, properly so called, is very little affected by political changes in the Government. The machinery is so complete in all its parts, that it works automatically; and the public are scarcely aware of its existence, except when, by a rare exception, some failure occurs. But the London County Council has no such body of permanent officers. The members are trying to do by irresponsible committees, which may or may not be attended by the same persons, what would be far more promptly and efficiently performed by a few responsible agents. They are masters trying to do the work of their own servants, which they can no more perform than they could bring a dinner to table without a cook, or manage their horses without a stable-man or horsekeeper. All the experience of life demonstrates that to have a thing well done it must be placed in the hands of a competent responsible agent. There is no virtue in numbers—'Quod multis peccatur inultum est.' Popular bodies are useful to deliberate, to debate, and to control; but they are the worst possible instruments of administrative government, until they find out the necessity of concentrating and, as it were, focussing their power in the persons of efficient representatives, officers, or servants. Mr. Burns has drawn a favourable picture of what has been done by the Building and Drainage Committee of the County Council; but he appears to suggest that he has done it all himself.

The evils that flow from administering the affairs of London by a number of small committees, entirely dependent on a large assembly, which is theoretically the one and only administrative body, might easily be still further emphasised. We have said enough, however, to show that the existing system cannot continue if London is to be well governed. It is no question of party politics, of Progressists or Moderates. For both sections of the Council it is of the utmost importance that a workable administrative constitution shall be secured for the Metropolis. For ourselves, we have no doubt that what London needs is, as has been pointed out by Sir John Lubbock and Lord Rosebery, a responsible executive. She requires an 'instrument of government' suitable to a country, rather than to a town. To secure this the County Council must begin by treating itself not as a directly administrative body, but as a local assembly of 137 'select' men, chosen to appoint and supervise the

actual administrators of the Metropolis. The Council's first business should be to elect from among themselves a chairman, to act as a sort of prime minister, their next to select, on his advice, fifteen or sixteen councillors to act with him as heads of the various departments of work undertaken by the Council. These heads of departments and the chairman would constitute a sort of metropolitan cabinet, and would form the executive of London. Sir John Lubbock suggests that these heads of departments should be in fact as in name the chairmen of small sub-committees of finance, main drainage, open spaces, and what not, but that, 'subject to confirmation by the Council, they should select their own committee men.' If they merely named four or five colleagues to assist in the work of the department, as the Secretary and Junior Lords of the Treasury and Admiralty assist the First Lords, the plan would, no doubt, be a wise one. If, however, the chairmen are, as Sir John Lubbock suggests, to be 'expected' to place representatives of the minority of the Council on their administrative committees, the chief advantages of the reformed system will be imperilled. With the presence of these representatives of the minority will disappear that responsibility which is sought to be imposed. The mother-thought of the scheme is that the will of the chairman is ultimately to prevail in each committee, and it is, therefore, much better that he should not be able in any way to shelter himself behind a representative of the minority but should be forced to take the fullest responsibility for the acts he advises and inaugurates. It is one of the chief safeguards of the constitution that a minister must be found to take the complete responsibility for every act done in the name of the sovereign, in order that if that act is ill-advised the country may know on which instrument of State to impose its censure. The sovereign can do no wrong, and bear no blame; therefore, before he acts, some person must be found ready to accept any blame that may attach to what is done in the sovereign's name. In the same way, though for a different reason, it is impossible to attach blame to a board or a council. If we are wise, then we shall insist that no act shall be done in the name of a board or council, so important as the London County Council, for which some definite person is not willing to take the responsibility. Sir John Lubbock, when he recommends that each committee should have upon it one or more representatives of the minority, fails to appreciate this, and strikes at the root of

that sense of responsibility which he, like us, desires to create. Strangely enough, however, he adds to his suggestion the following remark:—‘I think also that members of a committee who find themselves often obliged to oppose recommendations of the committee on important points would do well to resign, and take up some other sphere of work.’ In other words, he holds that these executive committees, nominated by their chairmen, should, in fact, be like their national analogues, the committees of Council, unanimous and homogeneous. The representatives of the minority are not to remain on the committees unless they can convert themselves to the views of the majority.

But it may be said, if an executive is thus to be carved out of the main body to do the work of administration, what is to become of the rest of the Council? Are the ordinary members to sink into insignificance and impotence, and is the voice of the minority to be entirely drowned? Assuredly not. Even if the current executive work of the Council is deputed to certain individuals who, until deposed from the carrying out of those duties, will bear their sole responsibility, there will be plenty of work for the Council to do. At the meetings of the whole body the minority would be able to interrogate the several chairmen of committees, and to oblige them to explain and defend their acts. Further, since the assent of the Council would be necessary before any new policy could be adopted, and since the expenditure of all moneys would have to be sanctioned by it, as well as the imposition of all rates and the raising of loans, the full Council meetings would never be without interest. No doubt it would be unwise to press the Parliamentary analogy too far. For example, the better custom would be that the chairmen of committees should not resign as a body because the policy pursued by one of them was condemned, and it would further be a useful constitutional etiquette that no chairman should resign except on a direct vote of want of confidence. To carry the hyper-sensitiveness of Her Majesty's Ministers into municipal life would be inconvenient and absurd. In criticising the estimates brought forward by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and in keeping a general supervision over the expenditure, the Council would be doing work which a deliberative body such as, owing both to its size and inclination, it really is, is well qualified to undertake, and work of a most important kind.

While dealing with the question of supply it is necessary to point out that the existing system of money voting is

most defective, and might easily lead to the gravest financial complications. At present any spending committee of the Council may, by obtaining a single snap vote, commit the metropolis to expenditure which has to be met forthwith by loan or rate. The salutary rules that obtain in the House of Commons for controlling the expenditure of the national resources are not followed in the County Council, and were a committee of faddists to induce the Council to agree to a scheme for municipal balloon omnibuses, the requisite money would have to be immediately provided by the Finance Committee. The Local Government Act, 1888, intended to prevent so fatal a facility in expenditure and to provide checks against a single vote of the Council being capable of dissipating the resources of the capital, but unfortunately the machinery provided by the statute has not proved effectual. Section 80 of the Act declares that

‘Any costs, debt, or liability exceeding 50*l.* shall not be incurred except upon a resolution of the Council passed on an estimate submitted by the Finance Committee. The notice of the meeting at which any resolution for the payment of a sum out of the County Fund (otherwise than for ordinary periodical payments), or any resolution for incurring any costs, debt, or liability exceeding 50*l.*, will be proposed, shall state the amount of the said sum, costs, debt, or liability, and the purpose for which they are to be paid or incurred.’

This clause reasonably interpreted should mean that any proposal for spending money above 50*l.* should be first submitted to the Finance Committee for their sanction. The Finance Committee ought, in fact, to stand at the door of the Treasury, and force every person demanding an expense of the municipal resources to make out a good case for such expenditure. They should do, that is, what the authorities of the Treasury in Downing Street do in regard to national expenditure—allow no expenditure which they are not themselves willing to recommend. Only in this way can that responsibility upon which we are insisting as an essential of good municipal government be secured and maintained. There must be an executive ‘minister’ or group of ministers who will undertake to be responsible for every item of expenditure, and who can be made answerable if the results of that expenditure are bad. The County Council can no more judge off-hand whether it is wise to spend a particular 2,000*l.* than can Parliament. An *ex parte* plea for expenditure, made in a popular assembly, is almost sure to look reasonable. The only safeguard for a deliberative body is to say, ‘We will not even hear these insidious

‘proposals for dipping into the money chest. We have appointed certain purse-keepers, whose business it is to recommend expenditure, and who can be made responsible for any misapplication of funds. Go to them, and if you can persuade them to assume responsibility for your proposed spending of money, well and good. If not, we refuse to hear you.’ It cannot be said that this system would tie the hands of the Council unreasonably, for if they found the Chairman of their Finance Committee adopting too economical a policy, or starving their services, they could, of course, depose him and choose another and more generous minister in his place. After all, the plan is only that adopted by all private persons of large means. The millionaire who sanctions any and every captivating plea for expenditure made by the head gardener, the stud-groom, the keeper, or the bailiff of the home farm, soon ceases to be a millionaire. If he is to remain solvent he quickly finds it imperative to make the stereotyped answer, ‘It sounds a great improvement, but I can’t order it till you have got the agent to agree and to recommend me to do it.’ It is ten to one, when the agent has gone into the matter, that he reports that a new orchid house is not the least wanted, or that, if it is, a rearrangement of the existing greenhouses will meet all requirements, that the present steam ‘separator’ is quite large enough, and that, though it might be an improvement to build three new gamekeepers’ lodges on the hills, it would be far better and more prudent to put the requisite expenditure on to next year’s ‘income.’ Unfortunately the late Council did not realise the importance of allowing no expenditure that had not received the sanction of the Finance Committee. Accordingly, they held that the Act is complied with if a proposal which comes direct from a spending committee is agreed to ‘subject to an estimate being presented by the Finance Committee.’ Lord Lingen, Sir John Lubbock tells us, has more than once expressed an opinion that this arrangement is contrary to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the Act, and this view we most heartily endorse. The Finance Committee are, under the plan adopted by the Council, deprived of all power of checking expenditure and merely register the decision of the Council. ‘As a matter of fact,’ says Sir John Lubbock, ‘the Finance Committee consider that after the resolution of the Council it would be useless for them to discuss the advisability of the expenditure, and they generally confine their attention to the mode in which the money should be raised. Every

‘committee naturally attaches special importance to its own department, and it seems very desirable, as was, I think, obviously intended by Parliament, that they should submit their plans to the Finance Committee, who might thus exercise some control on the general expenditure of the Council.’ It is very much to be hoped that the new Council will have the good sense to see the importance of making the Finance Committee the neck of the bottle through which all expenditure must flow. To do so will not be in any way to weaken the effect of the Progressist victory. Though of vital importance to the successful and efficient carrying out of any scheme of policy, Moderate or Progressist, both this and the other arrangements we desire to see adopted are, after all, nothing but matters of procedure. No Progressist councillor by assenting to them will do violence to any one of his principles, however advanced. Every item, indeed, of the administrative reforms we recommend might be adopted by the Progressists, who will now dominate the Council, not only without injury, but with advantage to their views.

The plan of appointing a responsible executive for London and of making it supreme throughout the administrative field which we desire to see carried out, would secure to the majority of the Council far more power than they possess under the present system. The existing arrangements give the minority a finger in every one of the administrative pies prepared by the Council. Those we advocate would free the majority of the Council from this impediment to their wishes and would at the same time make visible to London a particular set of men as responsible for a particular line of policy. This latter result would not, we feel certain, be unwelcome to the majority of the Council. The Progressists, whatever else they may be, are not lacking in courage, and do not desire, we may be sure, to obtain shelter from public criticism by associating with themselves certain *disjecta membra* of the minority. Where the power is, there let the responsibility be also. Sir John Lubbock, in the article which we have already cited, appears to hold that, in order to give London an improved administrative constitution, fresh legislation would be required. With all due deference to so great an authority we are at a loss to see how this can be. It appears to us that the new Council could, by passing a series of standing orders, inaugurate most, if not all, of the needed reforms. The appointment of a responsible executive is surely within their power as is the strict application of

the rule that all proposals for expenditure must be first sanctioned by the Chairman of the Finance Committee and made on his responsibility. But these are, after all, the main reforms required.

A reform which would, however, need Parliamentary sanction is the payment of the executive heads of department, whom we desire to see entrusted with the actual work of administration. The Chairmen of the Committees, as they would probably still be called, in deference to the English love of making name and status coincide as little as possible, would be exceedingly hard-worked officials, and ought, in our opinion, to be well paid. A great corporation like a State should be suspicious of voluntary work. It cannot be expected that men of ability and eminence, engaged in business or the active pursuits of life, can give the time and energy to municipal administration which would, if properly performed, demand every hour of their lives. Hence the office would devolve on men of a secondary class who have nothing else to do. The payment of salaries may in particular instances seem unnecessary, but it is nevertheless certain that, unless the men who devote their whole time to the work of the Council are paid openly and regularly, some of them will sooner or later be found unable to resist the temptation of helping themselves out of the funds entrusted to them, or of doing what is as bad—selling their influence for money. The Council, and so London, will have a far surer hold over those who are responsible for the actual work of administration if they are paid than if they give their services gratuitously. No one thinks it unreasonable that the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary, and the rest of the Cabinet should receive salaries. Why, then, should not the Ministers of London draw pay for the work rendered by them to the State?

Into any attempt to show the unwisdom of the London programme of the Progressist party, or to contest the views of Mr. Burns, Mr. Sidney Webb, or Mr. Charles Harrison, we do not propose on the present occasion to enter. The advanced party have won the battle, and it would be useless to argue with them as to the soundness of their views. It is now best that they should endeavour to carry out their scheme of policy. They have a fair field and full power, and if they fail the responsibility for failure will be clear. But though it would be useless to reargue the main points of the so-called London Programme, it may be worth while to address a warning to the Progressists on a point which

seems hitherto to have escaped their notice. In regard to the nation at large the friends of the Progressists are always telling us—and probably not without reason—that the refusal of the country people to stop in the country and their desire to get to London is the greatest difficulty of the age. How to keep the labourer on the land is the problem which is being perpetually offered us for solution. It is obvious, however, that, whatever may be the remedy, the chief cause of the depletion of the country districts is the attractiveness of London. Cheap food, cheap locomotion, cheap amusements, higher wages and more liberty of action offer attractions to the labourer which are only partially discounted by the one drawback to London—high rents. But the Progressist party desire to make use of the unexampled material resources of London in such a way as to very greatly increase its attractiveness and at the same time to diminish this one repellent influence of high rents. They propose to secure lower rents for working men, to cheapen locomotion still further, and to do many other things by means of public money which will put the man who lives in London at an advantage. Surely this course must be fraught with very great evils. We have no desire to say that London working men ought to be kept in misery in order to frighten away the country people. It is, of course, only just that the London labourers should achieve all the comfort and material happiness they can through their own exertions, no matter what the effect may be upon the country people. It is, however, very doubtful whether making life easier in London by means of public money will not in reality only injure the London working men. And for this reason. It will call a number of fresh competitors into the labour market and so will depress the rate of wages in London. If the County Council make it easy to live in London by providing cheap dwellings and by arranging that railways and tramways shall carry working men at specially low fares, they are certain to reduce the rate of wages now paid in the metropolis. The more people flock to London the greater the competition for work and the greater the fall in wages.

Mr. John Burns, in his very significant article in the March issue of the 'Nineteenth Century,' shows us that his ideal is a London in which the County Council, by assuming the control of the gas, the water-works and the tramways, and by doing and making directly all the thousand things required by a great trading corporation, shall become

by far the largest employer in London, and, further, shall pay those in its employ not the market but a *fair* rate of wages—shall fix, that is, a standard of living for its *employés* and then pay them enough to live up to it. This vision of material happiness, induced by municipal action, is no doubt a pleasant one, but it can never be realised. Let us assume that the County Council has become the employer of fifty thousand day labourers at wages above the market rate. How would such a spectacle affect the labourers in the country? Would not the knowledge that there were such a vast number of ‘berths,’ and, what is more, of easy and well-paid ‘berths,’ going in London attract an enormous number of country people? With so many prizes, who would stop to calculate on the risks of drawing a blank? As a matter of fact, however, thousands of those who would be drawn to London by the prospect of getting employment with so good a master as incorporate London would be disappointed, and we should be face to face with a body of unemployed far more numerous than any of which we have previously had experience. It is not difficult to imagine what would be the first thing demanded by the unemployed. They would argue and would doubtless enforce their arguments by their votes, that if there was not enough municipal employment to meet the demand for it more must be created. The County Council would, in fact, be asked to undertake public works not primarily because they were wanted but because employment must be found for the unemployed. We can have no excuse for ignoring what such a state of things leads to. Napoleon III. tried a similar policy in Paris with the result that he attracted to and maintained in the capital a body of men in perpetual need of public works. Those who want to see such a prætorian guard of labour established in London will support Mr. Burns and his friends in their efforts to make the municipal authority of the capital what Sir John Lubbock has happily described as ‘London, Limited’—a huge trading corporation, instead of what it should be, a committee of management for common affairs. No doubt Mr. Burns would be inclined to reply to our arguments by citing the Government dockyards and by pointing out that the nation is not ruined in spite of the fact that it employs so vast a number of men. We should answer by pointing out that the Government is not to anything like the same extent under the influence of the men it directly employs as would be the London County Council. The Government’s servants may be able to affect three or

four Parliamentary seats out of six hundred; those of a London municipality, acting as Mr. Burns would like to see it act, would control the entire administration. Besides, the Government is controlled by a vigilant House of Commons, whereas the London County Council is under no control whatever, and in regard to the management of its business is at present absolutely irresponsible.

Possibly, we shall be asked, by those who object to the drift of our remarks in regard to Mr. Burns's policy, what we propose to do in the matter, and whether we imagine that it is possible to check the growth of what Cobbett long ago called 'The Wen.' We do not imagine that it would be possible; nor are we of opinion that there is any objection to that growth as long as it is not artificially stimulated by municipal action. We have no desire to imitate our Elizabethan ancestors, and to recommend the issue of ordinances for 'the plucking down' of new houses in the suburbs. Nor, again, do we wish, as we have said before, to keep the London working men in misery in order that their condition may scare away the country folk. We are quite as anxious as Mr. Burns—and that he is sincerely anxious we do not doubt—to get rid of the slums, and to see the people of London living under healthier, and so happier, conditions as to fresh air, sunlight, and cleanliness. But in order to secure these conditions, we would not build municipal dwellings and let them below cost price. Rather, we would insist, with the utmost strictness, that no insanitary house shall be let for hire. We would carry out the laws against the letting of unhealthy houses as remorselessly as we would enforce those against the sale of diseased meat. A healthy and not overcrowded London secured in this way would not carry with it the seeds of its own undoing. It would not, as would a London filled with cheap improved municipal dwellings, attract thousands of newcomers from the country. London made healthy by the enforcement of the laws against the letting of unhealthy dwellings would exercise a diminished power of attraction on the country. And for this reason. Life would cease to be as cheap in the Metropolis as it is now. If the laws against insanitary dwellings were more rigorously enforced, the cheap dwellings that are now run up in the suburbs would not be built, while thousands that have already been built would be closed. As a result, half the houses now prepared each year, to accommodate newcomers would not be erected, and the newcomers would accordingly

find far greater difficulty than now in getting into London. To put the matter economically, the enforcement of regulations directed against the letting of insanitary houses would cause a decrease in the supply of houses, and so a rise in rents, and this rise in rents would decrease the attractiveness of London. That the working classes would suffer by this rise in rents we see no reason to suppose. The reason for this is plain. Wages would rise, owing to the falling off in the surplus supply of labour now produced by the influx of country people. Possibly this rise in wages might injure certain industries; but even if that were to be the case, the injury would not be too dearly purchased. London could afford to buy immunity from insanitary dwellings and overcrowding by the loss of a certain amount of trade. Perhaps, however, it will be said that this rise in wages would again attract the country labourers, and attract as successfully as life cheapened by municipal means. We do not think so. The municipal facilities for living in London would attract people to come on the chance of getting work far more than would a rise in wages. A working-man would argue—‘If I go to London and try to get work, I shall, at any rate, be able to live very cheaply while I am looking about. There is so much to be got free. Houses are cheap, and the trams take you about from place to place for nothing.’ On the other hand, the labourer, thinking of coming to a London in which life was not municipally cheapened, though wages were high, would probably reflect—‘I had better not risk it. Life is too dear in London. While I am looking about and getting nothing, I shall be obliged to be always spending. House rent is dreadfully dear, and every day I shall be obliged to be paying out money for trams and omnibuses.’ Life made cheap out of the rates would, in fact, act as a terribly potent advertisement.

Before we leave the question of municipal administration, we must advert to the great difficulty which was experienced in London by the Moderate party in finding good candidates. It is beyond question that the defeat of the Moderates at the recent election was in no small measure due to the lack of suitable candidates. Men capable of interesting the electors in the struggle were not forthcoming on the side of the Moderates, with the result that thousands of those who theoretically supported the Moderate side did not take the trouble to vote. The Moderate candidates, except in a few divisions, did not excite any enthusiasm, and hence voters availed themselves of the first excuse that came

to hand for not being at the trouble of voting. To those who desire good municipal government, this fact is perhaps the most unsatisfactory of all the unsatisfactory things connected with the London County Council. How to get the electors to take interest enough in the affairs of the Metropolis to go to the poll is, in truth, the question paramount. Representative institutions, when the electors will not take the trouble to choose their representatives, become the worst form of political mechanism ever devised by man, and every effort must therefore be made to find a remedy for a condition so perilous. We fear that the only remedy is to introduce party considerations into municipal politics. We are aware that there are many grave objections to this course, and recognise that in theory municipal should be kept apart from national issues. If, however, the electors do not find the municipal issues stimulating enough by themselves, we can see no way out of the difficulty but to couple them to the national issues. A half-hearted attempt was made to introduce party considerations into the late Council elections; but we cannot help thinking that, if the voting had been more vigorously conducted on party lines, London might have been saved the disgrace of abstentions amounting to half the electorate. The disadvantages of introducing party feeling into municipal affairs are obvious, and need not be recapitulated. The advantages which are often ignored may, however, be stated. If it became a matter of course that each political party should choose two candidates in each division, the work of getting good candidates would be far easier. There would, to begin with, be recognised organisations responsible for their selection, and organisations upon which pressure could be put, if necessary, to induce them to select good men. For example, a body of Unionist householders, if they thought that a bad candidate was being put forward in their division, would have an effective *locus standi* for protesting and for insisting on a better selection. Again, if the election were recognised to be one of party, party loyalty might be used as a lever to induce good candidates to come forward. 'If you will not help us,' might be said to some prominent citizen, 'the party will go to pieces, and we shall lose the seat at the next General Election.' This plea would often obtain a good candidate when every other inducement had been stated in vain. Again, the County Council might be made the stepping-stone to Parliamentary honours. If it were known that the best way of getting a seat in Parliament was service on the Council, we should

have no dearth of good candidates. Lastly, the attachment of members of the Council to one of the two national parties would make it very much easier to enforce that responsibility which is essential to good municipal government. The party organisations would be very effective instruments for showing how this or that councillor was responsible for some particular act of maladministration, and for bringing home to him the consequences of his misfeasance.

We have endeavoured in what we have written to say nothing that could prejudice the present Council in the eyes of the constituencies of London. They have been freely and fairly elected, and it is only right and proper that they should be given every opportunity to elaborate their policy. In pointing out the imperative necessity with which they are confronted as regards the reform of their internal constitution, we have in no way trespassed on debateable ground. If they give London an executive, they will only be facilitating the carrying out of their own ideas. In warning the Council of the dangers that may arise from the expenditure of vast sums of money, we have, again, done nothing that any reasonable man, whatever his opinions, need object to. Our only desire is that London should be well administered, and that the financial burdens which have produced such misery and impoverishment in the great cities of the Continent should not be placed round the necks of the rate-payers of the Metropolis. No fair-minded and no well-meaning man will deny that the enforcement of responsibility, economy, and efficiency ought to be the watchword of all who care that the affairs of the Capital should be well conducted. These are the three conditions which we desire to see prevail in London, and if they are not obtained none of the flattering projects which have been put forward in the programme of the recently elected Council will be realised.

ART. IX.—*The History of David Grieve.* By MRS. HUMPHRY WARD. 3 vols. London: 1892.

MRS. WARD comes before the public as a writer who has already achieved a remarkable success in fiction. Critics may regard 'Robert Elsmere' as an inartistic disjointed composition. Novel readers, impatient with its unwieldy length and uninteresting characters, may lay it aside as a laborious didactic treatise. Theologians may resent the weak attempt to grapple in a work of fiction with religious questions of the deepest importance, or marvel at the assumption which seeks to substitute a string of modern, but familiar, negations for the Christian creed of centuries. Each view of the novel is tenable. But success is a stubborn fact. No one can deny that 'Robert Elsmere' created an unusual stir, and provoked an almost unprecedented amount of criticism, both favourable and the reverse.

The explanation of this extraordinary success cannot be traced to the literary or artistic merits of the book. In 'Robert Elsmere' Mrs. Ward showed little aptitude for narrating a story or constructing a novel. But she gathered up much of the floating scepticism of the day, and interpreted it in the play of her fictitious characters. Her book was the embodiment of many of the thoughts which are rankling in human hearts. She gave utterance—however hesitating and uncertain the voice—to some indeterminate, inarticulate, but widespread, feeling that needed expression. At a moment when many religious-minded people are dissatisfied with modern expressions of their creed, or are beginning to lose confidence in their faith, she appealed to the strong interest that is always felt by the Anglo-Saxon race in the problems of Christianity. And she made the appeal in an acceptable form. Not only are a purpose and a sermon dear to the British public, but the method of the appeal widened the circle of her readers. Writing in a critical spirit, she yet showed herself capable of appreciating the results, if not the faith, of Christianity. 'Robert Elsmere' was characterised by none of that narrowness which generally limits the circulation of a religious novel to one particular party. Whether by accident or design, the one fine character that is delineated is that of a Christian woman; and, while one section might read in the book an assault upon Christianity, another might find it a tribute to the practical value of the creed assailed. The peculiar

crisis in human thought, the nature of the appeal, and the form in which the appeal was made, all contributed to the success of 'Robert Elsmere.' But as a work of art the book seemed to be so clumsy, as a source of entertainment so wearisome, as a theological treatise so unsatisfactory and inconclusive, that it required no special notice at our hands.

In 'David Grieve' Mrs. Ward returns to the same field in which she won her former fame, and she returns to it with the same defects and the same merits, but under somewhat different circumstances.

'David Grieve,' like 'Robert Elsmere,' belongs to the class of religious novels. Religion and fiction are each good in their distinct ways. But the results of the mixture necessarily are to breed a hybrid, and to destroy the artist in the advocate. The didactic purpose not only colours the author's view of life, and permeates the characters and their actions. It is also insisted upon with a persistency that subordinates art to the intellectual aim, the story to the teaching. It diverts the author from what is the true business of the novelist—the evolution of natural results from a natural plot by natural characters. It jumbles up the sacred and the profane in a form of literature which scarcely admits of reverence. It bids defiance to logic, for instances never make principles. Such a hybrid is an outrage upon art, which could only have originated among utilitarian Philistines. Mrs. Ward adopts the weapon of the Puritan, which has been wielded in turn by Evangelical and Anglican and Catholic. Instead of caricaturing a begging friar as a gargoyle, writers of religious fiction put their theological opponents into a novel. The one is avowedly a caricature; the other is professedly truth. Against such an artistic travesty it might be enough to protest in the name of art, if it had not become necessary to protest in the name of common sense. Mrs. Ward makes her puppets move and squeak as she directs. Her puppet show is a harmless amusement so long as the nature of the performance is recognised. So long as the voices and motives of the various members of the troupe are attributed to the strings in Mrs. Ward's hands, the fractious mixture of religion and fiction may be bad art, but it can do no intellectual harm. There are, however, persons who are either so stupid or so lazy as to take the play seriously, and to suppose that the fate of the actors is evidence on theological problems. That Robert Elsmere should lose his hold on Christianity, without attempting to

retain it, is no evidence of the falsity of the Christian creed. It would be equally sensible to see in the shrinking of a doll's limbs through the percolation of the sawdust an argument against the existence of a beneficent all-powerful Creator. In the preface to 'The Luck of Roaring Camp,' Bret Harte states the true objection to religious novels, and their worthlessness as evidence of the truth of the author's proclivities. Two Hogarth-like pictures were circulated for the benefit of Californian miners. One depicted the downward career of the dishonest digger; the other the rise of his honest rival. The shrewdness of the miner at once pierced the fallacy. 'Yer see it ain't no square game. 'They've jest put up the keerds on that chap from the start.' The selection of particular facts to suit a definite purpose inevitably leads to that suppression of truth which readily passes into the suggestion of falsehood. If the appeal is made to the feelings, and not to the judgement, if it is an attempt to interest rather than persuade, the substitution of fragments of truth for the whole truth is comparatively harmless. But a religious novel, such as 'Robert Elsmere' or 'David Grieve,' is written to persuade and to influence the judgement, and the omission of anything which can assist a man in forming or attaining a true opinion is a perversion of truth.

From the initial difficulties of her attempt Mrs. Ward never recovers either in 'Robert Elsmere' or 'David Grieve,' though her last novel is a powerful story, at times of absorbing interest. In both books there is the same careful workmanship, the same critical ability, the same gift of literary expression. In both books the effort is equally painstaking and equally apparent. Nothing, on the one side, is lost by slovenly neglect; nothing, on the other, seems to drop from her pen by chance. If 'David Grieve' is easier reading than its predecessor, it is because the subject is less theological and more human. Both books leave the same impression of cultivation rather than of originality. But in 'David Grieve' the reminiscences of other books, which haunt the mind like partially remembered tunes, recur more frequently. Here it is a scrap of 'The Mill on the Floss,' there a run from 'Wuthering Heights;' here it is a note from the 'Journal of Marie Bashkirtseff,' there an air from Guy de Maupassant. The same want of symmetry and unity of composition which marred 'Robert Elsmere' is again conspicuous in 'David Grieve.' In the later novel there are greater interest, more passion, more power, and more

pathos. But there are the same limitations and misapplications of the gift. The interest is frittered, not concentrated. The pathos is, in the main, homely; the power, hard and ungenial; the passion degraded to lust or avarice. There is the same incomplete handling of great subjects, not redeemed by the Miltonic weight of didactic purpose, or the Puritan's grim intensity of portraiture, which are the fruit of clear and definite convictions. There are, apparently, the same ends in view, the same colourless beliefs, the same innuendoes, assumptions, and assertions, the same unsatisfactory disheartening results—unsatisfactory because intangible,—disheartening because no further point is reached than was attained by 'Robert Elsmere.' There is also the same invitation to mental anarchy, without any plan for the reconstitution of beliefs; the same preaching of iconoclasm, without any provision of reconstruction; the same attempted destruction of the old religion, without any preparations for the new.

The plot of 'David Grieve' need not be told in detail, for the book itself has been widely read. It is a story in four parts relating the moral purification of David and the moral downfall of his sister Louie. There is the material for four novels, but it has pleased Mrs. Ward to throw them into the form of one. The first portion of the book describes the childhood of the hero and heroine at a Derbyshire hill farm, and the effect of their upbringing upon the boy, who is keenly alive to mental, moral, and spiritual influences, and upon the girl, who is hard, ignorant, 'unmoral,' and unimaginative. The second portion shows the boy in the commercial world of Manchester, struggling as a clever, self-confident shop-assistant, of good character and industrious habits, to rise in the world and to make a home for his sister in Manchester. France is the stage of the third scene, in which David, who has gone to Paris on business, accompanied by his sister, falls desperately in love with a French artist, and carries her off to Barbizon *en union libre*. At the same time, but without the excuse of the passion of love, Louie pursues the same course with a French sculptor. In the fourth portion the scene is once more transferred to Manchester. The curtain rises on David, now a prosperous tradesman, and his foolish wife; it falls upon a melodramatic scene, in which Louie, who has fulfilled her destiny, commits suicide at Barbizon.

Such is an outline of the plot. The two principal actors are David and Louie, the one often a fool, the other always

a field. Though David is far better drawn than Robert Elsmere, the interest still centres in the woman and not in the man. David's character is ready-made. There is no room for play of motive and passion. The lines are so strictly laid down by the author, that he runs an inevitable course from scepticism, or old-fashioned secularism, to loose living, and thence to commercial success and philanthropic respectability. Louie's character is the one which dominates the book and infuses it with living interest. She is a born prostitute, born to perdition. The tragic fate, which is the background of her history, throws her figure into high relief, as black storm-clouds accentuate objects on the horizon. Both these personages illustrate the strength and the weakness of Mrs. Ward's treatment of character. Within certain limits, and up to a certain point, her grasp is surprisingly strong. But it is, after all, a grasp of the surface, not a penetration of the inner depths. Either, as in the case of David Grieve himself, the lines are so deeply cut from the first, that neither play nor deviation is possible; or, as in the case of Louie, a single point is emphasised with exaggerated force. David is a carefully constructed machine, Louie a personified passion. In the first case, the character is mechanical, in the second monotonous; in both it becomes tedious because the round of feeling is either obvious or uniform. Besides these two principal figures there is a crowd of other actors with whom the same method is pursued. Each is distinct, consistent, and in admirable keeping. But the keeping, the consistency, and the distinction are achieved by the lower device of strong emphasis, not by the higher art of strong individuality. The actors are all studies in extremes; they either personify some passion, as in the case of Hannah or of Purcell, or some weakness, as in the case of Reuben or of Lucy. All, with the exception of Dyson, Ancrum, or Dora—against whose Christian creed and practice Mrs. Ward directs her shafts—excite either aversion or contempt. This entire absence of the quiet and the normal is one of the great artistic defects of the book. It is the less excusable in Mrs. Ward because she is not writing under the stress of overmastering imagination. She is making a deliberate study after a carefully matured plan.

The story, in which only abnormal exceptional characters play their parts, is totally wanting in repose or tranquillity. It is also deficient in symmetry or unity. The parts are separate and disjointed, the transitions forced, the changes

of scene sudden. The whole is a patchwork, not a unified drama. If it be argued that, in order to trace the development of two characters during a series of years, it is necessary to sacrifice unity, an example is ready to hand in 'The Mill on the Floss' which proves the contrary. As the figures are strained or exaggerated, so some at least of the incidents are wildly improbable. It is true that David Grieve was of French parentage on his mother's side, that he had read Voltaire and George Sand, and that he had taken lessons in French conversation. But he would not have understood, even with these advantages, a quarter of Elise Delaunay's conversation, or a word of the songs that were sung at 'Les Trois Rats.' The book is disjointed, and in one conspicuous scene improbable. It is also overladen with detail. 'Soyez vif et pressé dans vos narrations' is a maxim of Boileau, which Mrs. Ward has neglected. As a narrative 'David Grieve' perpetually drags—now from the laboured minuteness with which every figure is painted and every incident detailed; now from the frequent division of interest, which is drawn off in different directions and nowhere satisfied; now from the biographies which are appended to the introduction of each new actor, and which retard and interrupt the progress of the story. Parsimony is as true an attribute of genius as prodigality. But Mrs. Ward's mistaken realism obscures the effect of her pictures, and we cannot see the wood for the trees. Again and again passages are introduced which are totally irrelevant. Of this fault the visit to Haworth affords a notable instance. Another is found in the scene at 'Les Trois Rats,' which is scandalous in itself, and is rendered more scandalous by its superfluity, for it is only painted to throw into contrast the figure of Regnault, whose career and conversation are absolutely remote from the development of the plot.

The threads of Mrs. Ward's story are not sufficiently interwoven to form a pattern; the number of figures, and the detail with which they are introduced, diminish the prominence of the principal actors; attention is perpetually distracted from the central group; irrelevancies and superfluities are numerous. These are grave faults in the construction of a novel. To these defects we must, in our opinion, add characters that are either exaggerated or mechanical, odious or contemptible; a total absence of humour, a deficiency in simplicity, spontaneity, and ease of treatment; a continuous want of anything that is light, graceful, or fanciful; an excess of laborious realism, and a

defiance of proper proportions. In place of the simplicity, purity, and nature which have given to the English domestic novel its peculiar charm, we have very different qualities. There is a power, which is often surprisingly great, but which does not shrink from the bold handling of pernicious subjects; a passion which seeks its interpretation in exaggerated, distorted characters; a desire for sensation that finds its gratification in the slums of Paris; a gospel of life that leaves it doubtful whether the hero, who is its example, believes in anything or nothing. It will be an evil day for English homes when fiction of this modern type forms the staple reading of our sons and daughters.

The general impression left by a hasty perusal of 'David Grieve' is not removed by a second reading. In spite of its careful workmanship and its occasional felicities of verbal expression—in spite also of some really fine passages which few authors of to-day could rival—it appears to us to be as a novel a failure. Novelists may be criticised as entertaining writers, as artists, or as teachers. The first category is not one in which Mrs. Ward would desire to be classed, or, at all events, she would subordinate this feature in fiction to the other two. To weigh the merits of 'David Grieve' as a work of art is, therefore, our first object; to examine it as a gospel of life is our second.

The defects and merits of Mrs. Ward's work can best be tested by comparing or contrasting her with previous writers. If the comparative method in literary criticism is, by itself, rarely productive of positive results, it possesses undoubted advantages. To know what an author is not is halfway towards knowing what she is, and concrete parallels or contrasts are more convincing than abstract statements, however definite. To contrast Mrs. Ward with Miss Austen is to contrast two opposites; to compare her with the Brontës or with George Eliot is to accept a challenge which her writings almost irresistibly provoke.

Miss Austen wrote at a time when young gentlewomen walked out in pattens, talked of their *beaux*, busied themselves with domestic duties, and sat at home in the parlour to sew or to practise music. A female author, some forty or fifty years ago, wrote under difficulties; and Miss Austen, in deference to the feeling of the time, kept by her side a piece of muslin to cover up her manuscripts in order to conceal her occupation from callers. Contemporary politics, even though a relation who had escaped from the horrors of the French Revolution lived in the house, did not

excite her interest; neither social questions nor religious problems occupied her attention. Mrs. Ward's novel is a striking illustration of the distance which the century has travelled—for good and for evil—from the ideal of womanhood in 1800. 'David Grieve' belongs to an age when women dispute with men the possession of every field of intellectual and physical activity, and surpass their rivals in the variety, if not in the accuracy, of their knowledge of the world. It shows that a woman's mind can be absorbed and fascinated in those great questions of the hour which are the common problems of humanity. It proves, also, that a woman can be so keenly alive to what is marketable as to descend to competition with sensation scribblers in the elaboration of scenes, from the superfluous and gratuitous exhibition of which the self-respect of decent-minded men recoils in disgust.

In range of interests, and in knowledge of the world, Miss Austen and Mrs. Ward stand at opposite poles. In material, in method, in treatment, in results, they are almost equally divided. Miss Austen has no poetic faith in humanity, no belief in entire goodness of heart, no conviction that marriages are made in heaven. If she does not actually regard life as vanity, she contemplates it with a certain ironical amused complacency. Hence she tells her story with a half-veiled disdain for the absurdities of her actors, which is revealed in her trenchant politeness and her light sarcasm that plays over the surface in happily chosen words. The very limits that she recognises in the novelist's art secure for her work a completeness and a perfection which are almost impossible for those who ignore the conditions under which they work. Miss Austen painted only the class of society to which she herself belonged, and with which she was intimately familiar. Social sympathies were exclusive, and she represents them in their clannish restrictions. So far as we remember, only one servant appears in her books, and no farmers, tradesmen, or labourers are introduced on her stage. She drew only that which she saw. She is neither passionate nor picturesque. Many other novelists may have possessed more invention, greater vigour, more vivid imagination, more breadth of sympathy. There is in her novels little atmosphere; there is, as Charlotte Brontë said of her, 'no open country, no fresh air, no blue hills, no bonny beck.' She does not study romantic, energetic, or impassioned characters; her actors are ordinary people; her events are those of daily occurrence;

society presents itself to her observant eyes as a room full of figures dressed in plain clothes rather than as a fancy ball crowded with eccentric masks. She relies for her success on her feminine gifts of keen and faithful observation. If an average man and woman enter a room together, the woman sees twice as much as the man. Men only see the objects in which they are interested or have trained themselves to see, while women have a much more indiscriminate capacity for observation. Miss Austen never describes scenes or characters with which she was not thoroughly familiar. Her actors develop themselves in dialogue and in the progress of the story. We get to know them from the truthful individuality of everything that falls from their lips. She gives them certain marked traits for the sake of reality and animation; but we are never led to suppose that any sort of peculiarity is the salient attribute of their dispositions. The power of dramatic presentation as distinct from mere description never fails her. In scene after scene she continues her creations with absolute naturalness and without a trace of effort. Nothing is either forced or superfluous. Every touch serves to heighten the effect of a picture, to develop a character or unfold a climax.

Mrs. Ward's work is totally different. Her width of interest and warmth of sympathy do her honour. But she vexes our soul with obnoxious theories, and poses as the exponent of new views of life or freshly invented types of humanity. It is a relief to turn from her militant propaganda to Miss Austen's gentler and more feminine cynicism. In careful workmanship they resemble each other; but while Miss Austen aims at the fastidious finish of the miniaturist, Mrs. Ward aspires to the grander and more massive effects of the painter. Miss Austen recognises, perhaps too clearly, the limits which conditioned her work; Mrs. Ward is prepared to sacrifice symmetry and unity to the achievement of a didactic purpose, and when the most that can be said of a work of art is that it has a moral aim, it stands condemned as an artistic failure. Miss Austen's deficiencies are not those of Mrs. Ward. In 'David Grieve' there are passion and picturesqueness, abundance of descriptions of inanimate nature, and a series of characters who are nothing if not romantic and high-pitched. Miss Austen studies truth in the mass, Mrs. Ward in its exceptions. Mrs. Ward relies for her success less on observation than on imagination. She cannot have become thoroughly intimate,

as was Miss Austen, with the actors whom she describes, and the invention, which supplies the place of observation, is neither rich nor easy. Her figures are manufactured; they do not grow; they move stiffly, constrainedly, with effort. Instead of dramatic representation, she has recourse to lengthy descriptions, which introduce the actors, like the biographical notices appended to portraits in a picture gallery. She individualises them by emphasising the salient peculiarities; she gives to each some staring cockade as a distinguishing mark, like the hard greed of Hannah, the passion of Louie, the commonplaceness of Lucy, the ritualism of Dora, the vindictive bigotry of Purcell, the feebleness of Reuben. She needs strong lights, because true lights are but little at her command. While Miss Austen works by gradation, Mrs. Ward works by exaggeration. The actors of the one are complex characters, those of the other are personifications of single virtues or vices. The one preserves the individuality of her characters through a variety of different scenes, in each of which the figures are more fully developed; the other harps with monotonous iteration on a single string, and only calls up Louie for an outbreak of passion, or Hannah for a display of avarice. The creations of Miss Austen are living real beings, who are welcome visitors in our solitude, and their complex characters are developed with the even, natural course of a growing plant; her purity, simplicity, and truth, her archness of style, her subdued humour and playful irony, her gift of taking the reader into her confidence and making him see with her the fun of the play, and her deft-fingered neatness of finish, engrave her quiet scenes on the memory like pleasant recollections of actual life. Mrs. Ward's actors, on the other hand, remain mere *pantins* personifying theories, and their progress is developed in the midst of useless details, and forced on by abrupt transitions, which weaken the general effect, mar the sense of unity, and even dissipate the individual interest. In spite, or in consequence, of the conscientious labour which she has bestowed on the presentation of her scenes and actors, the sense of effort is the first impression that they leave upon the mind; and the second impression is, in our case, the wish to forget as speedily as possible most of the characters and of the incidents in which they figure.

To compare Mrs. Ward with the Brontës, or with George Eliot, is to institute a legitimate comparison, which is, as we have said, almost challenged by her writings. Here the

merits or the faults of the respective writers move in parallel lines; they do not meet from opposite directions. The appearance of 'Jane Eyre,' nearly half a century after the death of Miss Austen, revolutionised the orthodox system of novel-writing with its conventional heroes and heroines and its old-fashioned courtships. Here were the passion, the picturesqueness, the atmosphere, the vivid portrayal of romantic characters which are wanting in Miss Austen's writings, and which find a place in 'David Grieve.' Charlotte Brontë and Mrs. Ward meet on the common ground of the modern novel. But that ground, though shared by both, is very differently occupied.

The strength of the Brontë sisters lay in their imaginative expression of experience, and in the transcripts of actual incidents by hands that were capable of the deepest feeling. To the harmonious blending of the two feminine gifts of observation and passion they owed their pathos, their poetry, and their psychology. Brought up in the society of a violent, self-willed father, and of a brother who drank himself to death, moving among the rude, defiant, dogged inhabitants of remote moorlands, conscious of wide capacities for enjoyment, yet exposed to the grinding cares of poverty, or to the hard experiences of school teachers, or to the social inequalities of governesses, their views of life became hard and bitter. They fled to inanimate nature as to a tried friend, confident of finding there a refuge. No element except the sea exercises so determining an influence on the character as does the sombre scenery by which they were surrounded. The bleak expanses of the Yorkshire uplands—their melancholy moors rarely traversed except by a handful of itinerant packmen, or broken only by a few gnarled and weather-beaten trees—harmonised with and intensified their habitually gloomy cast of thought. The grey colouring of wind-swept upland wastes is over their lives as well as their books. They lived so near to the heart of Nature that they became her seers.

The books of all three sisters are transcripts from their daily surroundings, direct utterances of the thoughts of strong and suffering souls. They saw clearly; but they saw onesidedly, and under the influence of intense imaginative power. Their capacity for passionate emotion and their almost lyrical impetuosity of feeling may blind the reader to the power of close observation. But observation and experience were the basis of everything they wrote. Especially is this true of Charlotte Brontë. The timid shortsighted

girl had learned to regard life as the arena of covert hostilities, and expected her associates to be her enemies until they were proved to be her friends. She reconnoitred the strangers or the foreigners among whom she was plunged with a keen suspicious inspection which trained her to habits of almost microscopic observation, and enabled her to note and analyse a whole class of feelings that had never before been so minutely laid bare. Her field is narrow, but in it she moves alone as queen. Her realm is great, not from its depth, but from its intensity. The knowledge gained by grim experiences of life, and widened by her habitually watchful attitude, was coloured by a startling consciousness, derived from her sojourn in Belgium, of the stress that may be given to the material side of love. The combined product fills her books. She strikes the chords of the deeper passions of humanity, and she sweeps the strings with a firm and powerful touch. There is no feeble handling with the finger-tips, no dread of detail, no fear of the subject, no prettiness in the place of power. Her initiation into the secrets of sensual passion, and her strong truthful touches, rendered it inevitable that the epithet 'coarse' should be flung at her; her preservation of her true delicacy made it equally certain that the missile would miss its mark. The charge is contradicted on the one side by her purity of tone, on the other by her transparent genuineness. What she writes is frank and natural; it is neither the echo nor the imitation of passion; it is a real cry, wrung from the lips of one who was bred among outspoken northerners, who had not practised the politeness of euphuisms. And it is contradicted, also, by the strict and simple code of morality that is enforced. Passion, she seems to say, has no right which it can plead against duty: it must always give way. There can be no question, no two opinions on the matter. The path is hard to follow, but it is perfectly plain and unmistakeable.

When we compare the work of the Brontë sisters with that of Mrs. Ward, we are at once conscious of enormous differences, which may be summed up in the differences between truth and its imitation. The power with which some of the scenes in '*David Grieve*' are rendered is very great, and occasionally passages occur which bear the stamp and impress of genuine feeling. But, as a whole, '*David Grieve*' conveys little impression of reality, because it fails to carry conviction of any deep emotion. It is the result of general, not particular experience; of superficial rather than

profound observation. It is a critical reading from books and from newspapers, not a warm transcript from real life. The passion rings false and artificial; it is made the most of instead of being choked. It is thin rather than deep; extensive, not intense. It simulates, often with surprising skill, the real cry; but the note is not sustained, and its collapse proves the sound to be an imitation produced for a purpose. In the writing of Charlotte Brontë the white heat of the volcano, which glows beneath the surface, makes itself felt in the general impression; it bursts forth, in spite of the strength of the reticence, in the overpowering force of the reality. But in Mrs. Ward there are the simulacra of the smoke wreaths and the lava streams, but they proceed less from a resistless ebullition of nature than from a fire which is carefully fed and assiduously stirred. Mrs. Ward's passion is studied; that of Charlotte Brontë is genuine. In their descriptions of nature the same kind of differences is apparent. The direct glance of the Brontës, their fine appreciation of the meanings of external phenomena, their power of interpreting the effect upon the mind of material aspects, their gift of making us experience with our bodily senses the scenes that are described, are wanting in Mrs. Ward. All that a keen relish for scenery, a quick eye for its features, and a careful enumeration of the component elements which go to make up a landscape can do, has been done; but the *genius loci* of Derbyshire has not entered into the very being of Mrs. Ward as that of the Yorkshire moors has inspired the Brontës. And, as a consequence, the descriptive realism of the later novelist is tedious in its fidelity; the catalogue is complete, exact, and accurate, but we miss those sudden, unexpected touches which reveal an object in a phrase, like rays of light in a wood that fall upon a leaf, a branch, or a stump.

In their choice of characters the Brontës and Mrs. Ward resemble one another, and equally differ from Miss Austen. Neither of the modern writers have much power in describing those gentler feelings which men associate with the female mind; all prefer to delineate stronger and more masculine powers. But in the working out of their characters Charlotte Brontë shows a far greater knowledge of human motives, a keener analysis, a subtler psychology, than her rival of to-day. In their strong and fearless handling of dangerous subjects, Mrs. Ward and Charlotte Brontë have, apparently, much in common. But can the same defence be made for both writers which has been made for the authoress of 'Jane

'Eyre'? Has Mrs. Ward been brought from her youth upwards into daily contact with experiences such as those of Charlotte Brontë? Does the habitual delicacy of her tone contradict the inferences which may be legitimately drawn from her resolute handling of pitch? Does she in her writings constantly maintain the same high level of moral duty which made Charlotte Brontë appear to Thackeray's fancy as 'the austere little Joan of Arc marching in upon us and rebuking our easy lives, our easy morals,' or which left upon him the impression of her 'being a very pure, and 'lofty, and highminded person,' with whom there always seemed to be 'a great and holy reverence of right and 'truth'?

Between Mrs. Ward and George Eliot more resemblance can be detected than can be discovered between her and the Brontës or Miss Austen. Like George Eliot she has meditated on the deep problems of life. Like her she is strongly determined to soften nothing, and to paint the naked truth. Like her she is struck with the dingy, petty, narrow life of the British farmer, and illustrates its effect upon children of quick feeling or ideal aspirations. Like her she seems to write under the influence of the thought, 'God was cruel 'when He made women.' Like her she dwells on the bodily feelings which enter into the passion of love with a coarseness that we do not find in Charlotte Brontë. Like her she fails to subordinate her personal to her artistic interests, and obtrudes her intellectual views into the domain of art. Even offensive medical details are not omitted. But it is George Eliot in that decadence which dates from 'Felix Holt' whom Mrs. Ward most resembles. It is less the George Eliot of 'Silas Marner' than the George Eliot who has sunk the artist in the teacher, who has become discursive, and has lost her ease and spontaneity, her style, and her figure, in the pursuit of politics, science, or philosophy, whom we discover in 'David Grieve.'

As a child, George Eliot played in the old-fashioned garden at Griff, or fished in the neighbouring canal; she watched the 'milky mothers' standing patiently in the cowsheds, hid in the outhouses, or listened to the monotonous fall of the flail on the threshing floor; she unconsciously observed and noted the coming and going, the sayings and doings of rustic folk; she drank in at the most impressionable age the freshness and colour and changeable aspects of inanimate nature, the habits of mind, settled opinions, and modes of speech of farmers and labourers. In her childhood

and her girlhood she laid up the rich stores of observation and experience from which she drew her studies of provincial scenery, life, and character. It was the memory of early years that enabled her to strike out a new vein of society, and to walk in a hitherto unknown world with the same familiarity with which Miss Austen had moved among the moral squirearchy. She proved once more that writers need not pass beyond the bounds of experience, and that, on the contrary, they must follow its teaching, if they would give to their pictures the complete effect of reality and the rounded charms of homely truth. She made the new discovery that interest could be aroused and sustained by pictures of commonplace persons performing the everyday duties of ordinary life. Scott had sketched the characters of Andrew Fairservice, Caleb Balderstone, Dandie Dinmont, and the Mucklebackit family. But their introduction was incidental. They formed part of the background, which relieved or threw forward the principal actors. They afford no adequate parallel to a book like '*Silas Marner*,' which is entirely made up of the sayings and doings of the unlettered, uneducated inhabitants of a quiet English parish.

In her rustic pictures George Eliot showed the paramount gift of the great novelist—the gift of shaping and handling human characters in their mutual relations, and of making others realise the creations of her imagination as if they were actors in their own daily life. She interprets, at once literally and imaginatively, the humours and idiosyncrasies of the bucolic world. Her figures are living beings, thinking the thoughts and speaking the language of their conditions. Everything about them is individual, and belongs to them and not to the author; their opinions, feelings, motives, desires are part and parcel of their nature. They have the true rustic flavour; there is about them the scent of earth and air. The three Dodson sisters, for instance, are as distinct from one another as each is distinct from Mrs. Poyser. Yet all possess a strong family likeness. The same individuality of personal character, combined with community of class feeling, belongs to their husbands. Each figure is kept separate, and yet all are shaded off into groups. Nor does George Eliot's gift of noting characteristics, whether of individuals or of classes, stand alone. It is united with the yet higher gift of seizing the particular or the general key, and her complete mastery of the key is shown in the easy elaboration and almost careless profusion of the delineation. Her pictures owe their truth to their

comprehensiveness; it is not one aim or purpose, or a single thought and passion, that is transcribed, but the many motives and emotions of life and character as they act and react upon each other, that are represented. And to width of sympathy and of knowledge she adds that quick perception of contrasts which is the parent of true humour—the humour which is independent of mannerisms and artificialities, which creates a Mrs. Poyser, and renders her best writings a storehouse of shrewd mother wit and proverbial wisdom.

In her later novels all this is gradually changed. Her earlier books grew, her later works are elaborately planned, and the measurements and the calculations are distinctly visible. As she wanders further afield from rural life, she becomes more and more discursive. Her love of reflecting on moral problems weakens her power of weaving her stories into consistent wholes: they are left disconnected and incoherent. She loses her fine discernment of the due proportion and fitting relations between the different elements of her work, and is contented to leave two blocks in juxtaposition instead of welding them into a unified drama. She sinks the artist in the teacher or the thinker. She forgets that the province of the novelist is to narrate, and that, though he may do far more than tell a story, the telling of the story ought to be his first aim. She loses her hold on the sympathies, as she teaches politics or explains science, or improves the occasion like a Greek chorus. She loses sight of her object in order to speculate, moralise, or expound. She strains the patience of the reader by the introduction of technical jargon. She loses her style and her figure; her sentences grow tumid, her novels unwieldy. She studies realism at the expense of sensibility. Her fine and conscientious analysis becomes weary from its prolixity, and her easy and profuse delineation is exchanged for a forced and artificial elaboration. Her figures cease to live: they are the skeletons of subtle and profound study. They are no longer traced with the unconscious skill which familiarity with the subject confers, but are laboriously pieced together from books, or, at the best, compounded from carefully selected models.

If Mrs. Ward's work is compared with the best work of George Eliot, its deficiencies are at once apparent. She has had none of the exceptional training and advantages which equipped George Eliot, and still more Thomas Hardy, for the natural treatment of peasant life. Knowledge of human nature however profound, observation however careful, will never supply the place of personal contact, intimate acquaint-

ance, primitive experience. Mrs. Ward is only a literary reproducer of the Derbyshire farmer, and as such is driven to extravagance in order to conceal the poverty of her equipment. George Eliot eschewed exceptional characters and sought truth in the mass. Mrs. Ward's characters are extraordinary, and the truth which she attains is only truth in the exceptions. Her children are not—like Maggie and Tom—an ordinary boy and girl, but abnormal specimens of childhood, who may be true to the laws of their particular composition but are untrue to the general laws of child nature. In figures like Hannah or Reuben or 'Lias, the predominance that is given to one salient peculiarity hides the poverty of the delineation. We do not see at once, what would be conspicuous if the characters were cast in ordinary mould, that they have the thinness of abstractions, the one-sidedness of personifications. Not one ray of humour, not one spark of mother wit, lightens the dreariness of her rustic pictures. As on the one side she wants the intensity of Charlotte Brontë, so on the other she lacks the comprehensiveness of George Eliot. Her knowledge, like her passion, is but the gold leaf compared with the nugget. It is beaten out thin so as to cover the surface; but it is too superficial to be capable of depth.

But if we compare Mrs. Ward to George Eliot in her decadence, the resemblance is so marked as to suggest that the same fundamental disease is at work in both. Almost all that has been said of the later works of George Eliot applies to 'David Grieve.' The book is a manufacture, not a growth, and no successful effort has been made to move the traces of the machine. There is the same discursiveness which results in a patchwork instead of a woven pattern, the same throwing together of separate blocks into a juxtaposition which leaves them without connexion or coherence. There is the same tendency to preach instead of narrating, the same desire to expound, the same inclination to the introduction of technical jargon. And there are the same results—the same inordinate length, the same irrelevancies and superfluities, the same unwieldiness of volume. There is the same careful analysis and the same lifelessness; there is the same prolixity of realism. And, finally, in both authors there is the same didactic purpose which ruins George Eliot's work in the performance and Mrs. Ward's in the promise. Neither is content with indirect teaching; both desire to set up a signpost. The genuine narrator thinks first of his story; he does not endeavour to set forth

a theory. Indirectly a novel must present its author's view of life, because everyone sees things in a different way and is concerned to set them forth as he sees them. But though the theory may permeate both character and action, it ought not to be pressed upon the reader as a separate subject of contemplation. If there is this insistence on a particular conception of life, the story inevitably suffers.

And what is the teaching to which Mrs. Ward has sacrificed her work? If it is a true gospel of life which can elevate and inspire mankind, the inartistic defects of the novel may be pardoned, though the form in which it is embodied, and the methods by which it is enforced, are necessarily unsatisfactory and inevitably lead to special pleading. It would be as wise to depreciate the bone which holds the marrow.

A keen-witted, self-taught, susceptible boy, in whom the passionate blood of southern France is tempered by the cooler nature of northern Puritanism, grows up on a remote moorland farm wholly indifferent to religion, of which he knows nothing or only a repulsive form. He takes refuge from the dinginess of his surroundings in a dreamland of poetry and history, or in the vision of the wider world of real life which lies beyond the Derbyshire hills that is opened to him by novels. His religious indifference melts before the zeal of a Revivalist preacher, only to become once more hardened and congealed by his moral disgrace. In Manchester he passes into hostility towards Christianity as he gains a sense of freedom and omniscience from the teaching of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot. Then the contemptuous tone of his militant secularism is dissipated by the romantic enthusiasm of George Sand, and by the new ferment of passion, poetry, and imagination that surges within him as he grows into manhood. Moral perceptions he had none. Ethics were matters of taste. It is at this stage of his career that he conceives his wild love for Elise Delaunay, and with criminal selfishness acquiesces in the ruin of his sister. Awakening from his trance of passion he meditates suicide, but is saved from putting an end to his life by the intervention of a Christian friend. For a brief space the spiritual emotions of Ancrum and Dora draw him like a magnet towards revealed religion. He wonders whether the true key to life may not after all lie in the will and not in knowledge. But from this temporary landing-place he gradually drifts further and further away. Chiefly through the writings of German theologians he casts aside the 'mytho-

'logy of the Trinity,' the 'legend of Bethlehem,' the mythical actions of the Gospel narratives, and reaches that point at which Mrs. Ward and Robert Elsmere have arrived. Rejecting revelation and the miraculous facts of the Christian creed, he clings to theism, the idea of a protecting Providence, and a belief in the immeasurable superiority of Jesus Christ as a human teacher. Casting aside the divinity of Christ and the manifestation of God's love in His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection, he retains the Christian spirit. His gospel is God's Fatherhood and man's immortality.

This, as it seems to us, is the theological intention of 'David Grieve.' The book is, therefore, the complement of 'Robert Elsmere.' In the earlier novel Mrs. Ward shows us how a representative of the cultured classes demolishes the ancient edifice of his faith in order to erect his new tenement. In the later book, a representative of the wage-earning proletariat builds his dwelling upon a space that is open and unoccupied. Robert Elsmere finds salvation among the ruins; David Grieve evolves it out of nothing. The two books, read together, are intended to illustrate the effect of the tendencies of modern thought upon the classes and the masses, and to indicate the remedy. Analytical science, divorced from religion, is acting in many minds as a solvent of the old ideal synthesis which moulded the speculations, guided the energies, and formed the habits, of European thought. Through newspapers, magazines, lectures, conversation, it fills the atmosphere. Wherever it spreads, it withers faith in the unseen, the infinite, the supernatural. Our metaphysics, our poetry, our newspapers, our art, our divorce courts, our police reports, indicate the effect upon thought, literature, and morals of the decay of faith. Educated men and women remain professing Christians; but they lapse into indifference, regard culture as incompatible with religion, and wrap themselves up in the present. Our wage-earning millions, who, if not anti-Christian, are, to a large extent, non-Christian, are equally, though differently, affected by the change in the intellectual atmosphere. The habits of thought which they insensibly cherished slip off them; they stand aloof from religious agencies, and look to the future for a creed which shall satisfy their utilitarian requirements, their economic needs, and the negative demands of such distorted ideas of agnostic science as may have filtered down to their minds.

A time of trial is coming upon this country at a dangerous

crisis. A half-educated democracy is, for the first time, not only alive to its wants, but awake to its powers, and determined to use them. If religion is to be banished from public and private life—if those beliefs in supersensuous things, which have given life its ideas and duty its sanctions, are to be consigned to the catacombs—if the greatest witness to the truths of man's moral freedom and man's moral responsibility is to be repudiated, what is to be the consequence? If the coming democracy is not to be a Christian democracy, what is it to be? Can the negations of science dominate life or govern morals? Can the Christian character be retained when the Christian creed is abandoned? Will the British workman be content with the *Ni Dieu ni maitre* of the French artisan? Will he place his Utopia in an open, instead of a restricted, scramble for the good things of this life? Will his highest goal consist in exchanging for the sovereignty of the utilitarian few the sovereignty of the utilitarian millions? Will he enthrone appetites in the place of ideals, pursue his pleasure under the specious mask of some more or less resounding phrase, or varnish the grosser passions of the human animal with an æsthetic veneer? Will he build his commonwealth on the shifting basis of a majority in the House of Commons, and, if so, will such a state endure a storm?

Such are, as we think, some of the questions which most reflecting men and women are anxiously considering. They recognise the imperative need of ideals when an untrained, half-educated democracy is rising to power among the solitudes which utilitarian ethics, experimental science, and mechanical secularism have produced. They see the danger, they ask anxiously for the remedy. Some, denying to religion its miraculous claims, dally with occult sciences and strive to penetrate the mystery of life with such aids as spiritualism and kindred forms of inquiry provide. Others nourish the hope of the advent of a new era of humanitarian progress, and, in a bankrupt age, draw heavy drafts upon faith by proclaiming its approach. Some hold fast, with undiminished confidence, to the historical creed of centuries as it is held in the Church of this country. Others seek a refuge from the storm in the bosom of Roman authority. Others, and Mrs. Ward among them, desert Christianity as a hopeless wreck, and trust for safety to rafts which their own hands have pieced together.

Mrs. Ward's creed is an attempt to meet the wants of the age, and to save something from the wreck. The ideal

which she offers is indisputably better than none at all. But, in the first place, the assumption which Mrs. Ward makes at the outset remains unproved; and, in the second place, the new gospel is far less reasonable than the old.

Mrs. Ward assumes that Christianity is a wreck. So confident is she in her assumption as a patent fact, that she is astonished at 'the contented ignorance of our clergy, the 'solemn assurance of our religious press.' But her only achievement in the way of Gospel criticism is to flourish in the faces of her readers some of the best known positions of German theology. No one, we will venture to say, has ever studied the German critics as a school and retained his respect for their sobriety of judgement. Industrious and suggestive as they are, their opinions are more wanting in balance than those of many who are their intellectual inferiors. If the issue between the critics and the defenders of Christianity be one of evidence, that evidence must be treated with ordinary fairness. But the bias of the German theologians is so strongly marked that their attitude and methods can only be compared to those of a *procureur général*,—who starts from the assumption that the evidence for the defence is necessarily false. Mrs. Ward cheerfully accepts the task of dramatising German theological thought, without contributing anything more original than the dramatic setting. As a serious teacher she has yet to make her mark.

If, then, the initial assumption is unproved, there is no reason to regard Christianity as a wreck, and none to seek safety in Mrs. Ward's raft. But supposing the historical creed, which affirms its faith in the actual revelation of God to man in the Person of Jesus Christ and in His Life, Passion, and Resurrection, to be obsolete, what is the proof that Mrs. Ward's gospel is one whit more reasonable than the old? By its reasonableness the new gospel holds together or falls to pieces. Let us test it in its two principal features—the Christian spirit and the Divine Fatherhood.

Mrs. Ward seeks to appropriate the Christian spirit without the Christian creed—to proclaim the historical, and discard the miraculous, Christ. She repudiates the 'legendary accretions' of the Gospel narratives in which that Christian spirit is embodied; she rejects the miraculous elements which are there indissolubly interwoven with the moral and spiritual teaching. The answers are old as the hills; but they have lost none of their cogency or force. Cut away the miracles from St. Mark's Gospel, and what credibility can be claimed for any portion of the teaching?

The Christian spirit necessarily evaporates in the critics' process. The Gospel stands or falls as a whole. To disbelieve the miraculous portion is to reject the authority of the moral and spiritual lessons. Or, again, to take the discourses in the Gospel of St. Matthew, which German criticism accepts as in the main trustworthy. The claims which Jesus Christ there makes upon the souls of men is not human, but Divine; the relation that He there occupies is that of Creator and Judge. 'Aut Deus aut vir non bonus.' What valid escape can Mrs. Ward find in her German textbooks from the horns of the dilemma?

Mrs. Ward proclaims the Fatherhood of God. But if she seeks to establish the truth that God is love, on what facts does she rest her argument? Does she find it in the mass of misery and vice with which the world around is weltering? She denies the Incarnation of Jesus Christ; she denies His Resurrection. She accepts His life of sacrifice and His death for mankind, but she accepts them only as historical facts in the passage through existence of a human being. By rejecting the Incarnation, she robs the career of our Lord upon earth of its significance as the highest manifestation of Divine love; in denying His Resurrection, she destroys belief in that Divine victory which conquers for men the dreary conditions of finite human existence. She forgets that the belief in the Fatherhood of God has been called into being, maintained, and propagated by Christianity, and she assumes, without an atom of experience to justify the assumption, that the belief will be preserved when the facts upon which it has hitherto rested are destroyed. Without the evidence of the miraculous facts of the Christian creed, what reasonable ground of hope can Mrs. Ward supply that God is a Father and not merely a Force?

Her gospel then is, in our opinion, far less reasonable than the Gospel for which she proposes its substitution. So long as Christianity holds its ground, her creed may enjoy a vicarious existence. If Christianity were to fall, her creed could not live a moment. Does Mrs. Ward believe in it herself? Her characters, and their actions, seem to contradict the supposition, and her book as a whole demolishes her theories. It also affords negative evidence to the contrary. The live coal of religious inspiration touched the lips of an illiterate tinker, transformed him into a poet and a philosopher, and fused his allegory into a work of art and of genius. Any creed, be it even a creed of destruction, if firmly held and deeply felt, will exercise the same fusing power. But

Mrs. Ward's negations, criticisms, doubts, and questions, even when eked out by assumptions and assertions, are powerless to awaken the grey ashes into life, incapable of supplying a central motive or creating an organic unity; impotent to force into cohesion the separate masses which remain cold, solid, individual.

Yet such an attack as Mrs. Ward's might well put the defenders of Christianity on the alert. Some of the truths that they uphold require to be restated and redefended. Results of scientific discovery need to be met with courage, and systematised into a Christian philosophy which shall satisfy the aspirations of the day. The Christian religion must show its practical sympathy with the social questions that are on every lip. Thus only can Christianity, as an ever present reality, prove the ideal of the coming Democracy.

ART. X.—1. *Across Tibet*. Being a translation of 'De Paris au Tonkin à travers le Tibet inconnu,' by GABRIEL BONVALOT. Translated by C. B. PITMAN. 2 vols. 1891.

2. *The Land of the Lamas*. Notes of a Journey through China, Mongolia, and Tibet. With maps and illustrations. By WILLIAM WOODVILLE ROCKHILL. 1891.

IN this age of research and exploration there are few portions of the globe which have not been tested by the boiling-point thermometers and theodolites of inquiring travellers, and obscure regions of the earth which were little known to our fathers have now been so systematically traversed that the searchers after geographical knowledge are driven into still more remote and inhospitable districts for the discovery of any new thing. Africa, which until lately has been a sealed book, is rapidly becoming a field for tourists and sportsmen, and we are almost as familiar with the features of Kilimanjaro as our fathers were with the form of Etna. At the present rate of research, the time is not far distant when every corner of the globe will be mapped out with the accuracy of an English county. It is not long since that we noticed in the pages of this Journal a work* by an Indian civilian, who, when given a well-earned leave, instead of taking ship to England, sat down to consider in what untravelled part of the world he could

* 'The Long White Mountain.' By H. E. M. James.

spend his holiday. His choice fell on the unknown portions of Manchuria, and the world at large benefited by his choice. Much the same sort of spirit of adventurous research seems to have instigated Mr. Rockhill, and M. Bonvalot and Prince Henry of Orleans, to invade the inhospitable regions of Tibet.

It is a peculiarity of this spirit of exploration that the beauty or fertility of the country to be traversed forms little or no part in the calculations of the pleasure to be derived from the journey. Arid plains, bleak mountains, and frozen seas constitute an almost equal temptation with peopled valleys, rich landscapes, and flourishing cities; and the highlands of Central Asia attract the restless feet of European explorers equally with the rich cities and crowded waterways of the still unfrequented districts of Central China.

Tibet, however, offers an additional temptation in the fact that, besides being practically unknown, its frontiers are jealously guarded against the inroads of Europeans. Lh'asa, the supreme object of every explorer's ambition, has been reached only by Thomas Manning (1811) and Huc and Gabet (1844-46). Repeated attempts have of late been made, both from India and Western China, to break through the barrier drawn round the country. But they have one and all failed. Nor have those who have approached the desired region from the North been much more fortunate. Prjevalsky, and now Mr. Rockhill, M. Bonvalot and Prince Henry, succeeded only in traversing small portions of the most uncongenial districts of this ill-favoured land. There cannot be a doubt that before long the Chinese cordon which now surrounds Tibet will be completely withdrawn; but it is a feature of the Chinese character that they give nothing until they give everything. Up to the moment when they yield all along the line they protest vehemently that no concession can be granted, and they will one year declare war to the knife against an innovation which they will the next year adopt in its entirety and jealously defend. The queue is a remarkable instance of this peculiarity. When first imposed on them by the conquering Mauchus as a badge of submission, it was fiercely resisted *vi et armis*, and whole districts were laid waste and cities were depopulated in wars of which this badge formed the subject of discord. No sooner, however, had the conquerors succeeded in enforcing their decree than the people readily adopted the change, and at the present moment the queue forms one of the most cherished distinctive marks of the race. In the same way Corea, which was as much a forbidden land as Tibet itself, was thrown open from

north to south as soon as the Chinese power of resistance was overcome. While that country was unexplored, it was credited with all the magnificence which belongs to the unknown; but so soon as its secrets were discovered, its barren dreariness saved it from all further curiosity on the part of travellers. So will it be with Tibet. It cannot be long before its high roads will be trodden by any European who may wish to spy out its nakedness, and with the disappearance of mystery the country will be left to its inherent wretchedness.

At present, however, the frontiers are besieged on all sides by travellers, merchants, and missionaries, who are anxious to break down the wall of partition which separates it from the rest of the world. Even now an army of Christian missionaries of all shades of belief—from members of the Inland China Mission to Roman Catholics—are waiting to carry the tenets of their faiths into the nation of priests; the Indian Government, warned by the failure of the Macaulay expedition, is watching for an opportunity to send a mission of more modest pretensions Lh'asawards; and on the North travellers are constantly attempting to make their way over the dreary wastes which form the most effectual protection to the inhabitable portion of the country. The two latest invasions from the North are those described in the two works which are placed at the head of this article.

Both in design and conception these two expeditions were as unlike one another as they could possibly be. The one was begun in a spirit of adventure, without any plan, in complete ignorance of the route to be followed, and without any provision for securing the scientific results which might be expected to flow from it; while the other was undertaken after years of preparation and of study, with carefully mapped-out alternative itineraries, and with every precaution necessary to realise the full value of the facts and discoveries which it was hoped might reward the traveller. The inspiration which moved M. Bonvalot to march across Asia was found in a trifling conversation in Paris, during which M. Bonvalot expressed a newly born wish to find his way from the Russian frontier to Tonquin, and airily drew his pencil in a straight line 'through Chinese Turkestan, the higher tablelands of Tibet, and the valleys of the great rivers of China and of the Indo-Chinese peninsula,' to indicate the route he would follow. Happily for him, he found a travelling companion in Prince Henry of

Orleans, who proved to be an invaluable support and most loyal friend in all the difficulties which overtook the expedition.

After making some preliminary arrangements in Paris, the travellers went to Russia, where the real work of preparing for the journey had to be undertaken. Rachmed, an Uzbek, who had accompanied M. Bonvalot in his two previous expeditions into Asia, and Father Dedeken, a Belgian priest with a knowledge of Chinese, and his Chinese servant, made up, with the two travellers, the nucleus of the expedition. Having gathered together a certain number of followers, the explorers, leaving Kuldja, plunged into the Central Asian wilds, and are most heartily to be congratulated on having survived the dangers and difficulties to which their complete unpreparedness rendered them liable. They had no escort, no felt tents, and no Chinese passports. M. Bonvalot makes light of Chinese passports, and attributes such measure of success as attended his venture to his omission to give notice of his journey to the Tsung-li-Yamun at Peking.

‘By asking,’ he adds, ‘for a passport to travel in those parts of China which have been little visited, we should have excited the attention of Chinese diplomacy. The mandarins would have given us the warmest letters of recommendation, and then, as soon as our itinerary was known, would have sent orders for every sort of means to be used to stop us on the road, and compel us to turn back.’

In reviewing this question in the light of subsequent experiences he must be aware that this omission was a great mistake. It is seldom that a foreigner armed with a passport receives indignity at the hands of the Chinese officials. From inquisitive and riotous people he is always subject to annoyance, but by presenting themselves on the Chinese frontier without any guarantee as to their respectability, or even their nationality, the travellers laid themselves open to the detention and contumely to which they were subjected during their passage through Western China. It is, however, much to be doubted whether M. Bonvalot was in a position at starting to have applied for a passport, since this would have necessitated a statement of the route he proposed to follow. At all events, his companions knew nothing of his intention to penetrate into Tibet, and even Prince Henry was not enlightened on the subject until by chance the party met some pilgrims returning from Lh'asa, from whom they learned the direction in which that city stood.

In fact, from beginning to end, the expedition was a hap-

hazard adventure. The travellers entered the desert which separates Kuldja from the district around Lh'asa without any adequate idea of the hardships which they were about to endure, or any directions as to the exact course they were to steer. As a record of endurance the report of their journey is certainly noteworthy, but when we reckon results, we are obliged to admit that they weigh lightly in the balance against the loss of life and miseries which accompanied their march. On the surface of the globe there is not a more inhospitable and uninteresting line of country than that followed by M. Bonvalot and his companions until they reached the Chinese frontier.

Separated from the sea by a vast distance and by ranges of lofty mountains, the uplands of Eastern Turkestan and Tibet are cut off from the sources of that moisture which is necessary for the maintenance of vegetable life. No tree nor any green thing breaks the monotony of the sandy and rocky waste. So great is the dryness of the air that the very rocks crumble into dust, which, mingled with the sand, is scattered in an almost perpetual dust storm by the high winds which constantly prevail. From the same cause the cold is intensely severe, and more than twenty degrees below zero are often registered during the wintry months of the year. For many weeks M. Bonvalot and his companions travelled without seeing a human being or a habitation of any kind. No grandeur of scenery nor object of interest presented itself to their weary gaze, while disease and fatigue wrought havoc among their followers and animals. Two of their servants died on the road, and those horses and camels which survived the journey were reduced to the most pitiable condition. The horses were incapable of the slightest exertion, and the camels were kept alive only by meals of dough and paste.

With such surroundings we are not surprised to find even M. Bonvalot admitting that their circumstances left much to be desired.

'In the first place,' he says, 'the food is such that the least fastidious appetite wearies of it. Our bill of fare is always the same: meat boiled in mutton fat, tea which never really boils on account of our altitude, and made with water which is sometimes brackish and always dirty, which we get by melting ice which is full of impurities. The frozen meat, too, which we have to chop with an axe, is always tough and never cooked through, while when we try vegetables or rice we find it impossible to soften them, and they crackle between our teeth. The dust, mud, and sand which we have swallowed, and the numerous hairs from our furs and beasts which we find in our food, are things

to which we have long ceased to pay any attention, for here we have no longer any pretensions to cleanliness, and we have come to consider even a washing of the hands as a thing of the past. Our cheeks are puffed out with the cold, our swollen eyes, our chapped lips, do not differ much in appearance from those of the natives.'

In this condition they arrived on the shores of the Tengri Nor, where they were met by a Chinese mandarin from Lh'asa, whom M. Bonvalot describes as the Amban or resident at the court of the Talé Lama, and who, finding that they were travelling without passports, peremptorily forbade their moving in any direction but that from which they had come. In their exhausted state they were not in a position actively to resist. However, after much wrangling and persistence on their part, they were allowed, under surveillance, to take an easterly course towards the Chinese frontier. At Tatsienlu they received another check, and it was not until after a month's delay that they were able to shake the dust of that city off their feet. By this time M. Bonvalot must have heartily regretted that he had not taken out passports. To attempt to travel through a populous country like China in defiance of the regulations laid down by the authorities is to court disaster and discomfort, and if this truth had not already forced itself upon him, his subsequent experiences between Tatsienlu and Tonquin must have made him fully conscious of it. Fortunately for the travellers, they met at Tatsienlu an English naturalist, a Mr. Pratt, who undertook the charge of their natural history collections, which in their sorry plight they were unable to take with them, and who carried these solitary trophies of their journey safely down the Yangtszekiang to Shanghai. There, as at Tatsienlu, the irregular conduct of the expedition produced its fruit. The French Consul would have nothing to say to the packages brought by Mr. Pratt, and it was only through the kindness of the Procurator of foreign missions that they were eventually shipped to France.

It is a pleasure to turn from the account of this recklessly conducted expedition to Mr. Rockhill's pages. The difference between the two narratives is comparable to that which separates the story of a guerrilla raid, however dashingly conducted, from an account of a well organised campaign. For years, as Mr. Rockhill tells us, he had dreamed of visiting Tibet, and in 1884 he joined the United States Legation at Peking with the sole object of preparing for the ambition of his life. After four years of study, devoted to acquiring a knowledge of Chinese and Tibetan, he started on

his journey. The question of routes had been long and deeply considered. Most travellers had attempted to enter Tibet either from India or Western China, and of late years all such attempts had failed. The campaign undertaken by the Chinese Government against the invading Nepaulese in 1792, and which ended by the utter defeat of the Nepaulese within measurable distance of Khatmandu, had sealed up the passes leading into India, forbidding either ingress or egress; while the intrusion of a foreigner into the thickly populated districts adjoining the frontier of Western China had invariably excited the suspicion and animosity of the people. On the northern frontier of Tibet no such obstacles existed, and there was evidence of the practicability of the route in the fact that it was by it that MM. Huc and Gabet penetrated as far as Lh'asa itself.

This, then, was the road taken by Mr. Rockhill, who, in the dress and with the outfit of a Chinaman, left Peking in the winter of 1888 on his adventurous journey. Small-scale maps are much to blame for confusing our ideas of distance, and few people would suppose that 1,350 miles separate Peking from the first stage in his journey, Lanchou Fu, the capital city of the western province of Kansuh. Up to this point the journey was made in a Chinese cart, and in course of it were encountered scenes and scenery such as might of themselves have formed the subjects of a goodly sized volume. The walls which surround Chinese cities are palpable evidences of the unsettled state of the country, and scarcely had Mr. Rockhill got beyond the outskirts of Peking when he found the country people armed and prepared to resist the banditti, who, as we have recent cause for knowing, make the neighbourhoods of large cities their happy hunting grounds as the winter closes in upon them. From this belt of disturbance Mr. Rockhill passed with safety into the more peaceful loess country, where Nature has suggested to man the propriety of returning to the primitive state of troglodytes. This curious loess formation, which in north-western China extends over an area as large as France, covers the ground in many places to the depth of a thousand feet. Being very light and friable, it is incapable of forming the beds of streams and rivers, which cut their way through it to the more solid surface beneath, and as one of its peculiarities is that it cleaves vertically, the banks of such waters are invariably bordered by perpendicular cliffs. On the faces of these precipices the people dig out their homes, which enjoy the advantages of costing a mere trifle, of being ex-

ceptionally warm, and of being capable of indefinite extension as the requirements of the households increase. Though in years of seasonable rain rich crops are reaped from the surface of the loess, its porous nature renders it peculiarly susceptible to drought, and the people here, as elsewhere in China, live perpetually with the fear of starvation before them. The recollection of the Tartar tents which survives in the architecture of ordinary Chinese houses has often been remarked upon, and it is curious to find that some of the homes of the people in the neighbourhood of the loess country are, in the same way, built in strict imitation of the cave dwellings. Another stage carries the traveller into scenes which might meet his eye in Constantinople. The Buddhist population are exchanged for Moslems. Veiled women are to be seen in every street, and customs peculiar to Mahomedans take the place of those prescribed in the Book of Rites. Yet again, at the town of T'ungkwan, Mr. Rockhill was reminded of the very narrow frontier which separates British India from Chinese dependencies by the presence of the Nepaulese ambassadors, who were on their way to Peking with their quinquennial offerings of tribute. The regularity with which the Nepaulese present themselves at the Chinese court would be a flattering testimony to the far-reaching powers of China were not the suspicion justified that a keen sense of personal self-interest sharpens the edge of their loyalty. No inquisitive custom-house officials at the frontier inquire into the contents of their ample 'baggage,' which is transported free of cost to and from the capital. From the time the mission steps on Chinese soil until it leaves it again the envoy and his followers are the guests of the Son of Heaven, and in exchange for a ceremony at Peking, which, however derogatory it may appear to Europeans, is not so regarded by Orientals, they are enabled to carry back with them substantial tokens of the commercial wealth of the Chinese. This system of rewarding political service by private perquisites enters into all the Chinese relations with the border countries. At Sinning, near the Mongolian frontier, Mr. Rockhill made the acquaintance of the Amban, or governor, of the Kokonor Tibetans. Under this functionary are thirty-two agents, whose duties are to carry the orders of the Amban to the different local chiefs, to arbitrate in matters in dispute between tribes, and to collect tribute. The official pay of these men amounts to about 6*l.* per annum, but the taxes which custom justifies them in levying on their visitation rounds supply them with incomes which enable them to make ample provision for their declining years.

Westward from Sinning the traveller passes beyond all semblance of Chinese life. The innumerable dishes of a Chinese dinner are exchanged for a staple food of tea and tsamba, or parched barley.

'To this Spartan diet they occasionally add vermicelli, sour milk, granulated cheese, or boiled mutton. The tea, previously reduced to powder, is put in the kettle when the water is hot, and is left to boil for about five minutes, a little salt or soda being added. Then it is placed before the inmates of the tent, squatting in a circle. Each one draws from the bosom of his gown a little wooden bowl, also used on very rare occasions as a washbowl, and fills it. Taking with his fingers a chunk of butter from a sheep's paunch filled with it, which has also been set before him, he lets it melt in his bowl, drinking some of the tea and blowing his melted butter to one side, and then adds a handful of tsamba from the small ornamented bag in which it is kept. He deftly works with his right hand the tea, butter, and tsamba into a ball of brown dough, which he eats, drinking as much tea as is necessary to wash down the sodden lump.' (P. 79.)

This is not a pleasant picture of a family meal, but it is typical of the life of the people. Without any ray of light to lead them to anything higher and better than their surroundings suggest to them, they pass their lives in a condition of squalor and coarseness which is unexampled among peoples above the rank of savages. Water is rarely used for washing purposes, and the constant application of grease to the face, to preserve the skin against the parching influence of the extremely dry climate, adds a repulsive feature to their usually plain countenances. Their domestic life reaches a level even below that of most-uncivilised races. Female chastity is regarded as a thing of nought. A wife is commonly bought for a few sheep, horses, or yaks, and the bargain in no way implies that she is the exclusive property of her purchaser. Mr. Rockhill gives a curious account of a *fête d'amour* which is held in the lamaseries of the Amdo country, within the borders of the province of Kansuh, and which affords a strange instance of this freedom from all domestic ties. This saturnalia is known as 'the hat-choosing festival,' and lasts for two or three days. During that time any man may carry off the cap of any girl or woman he may meet in the temple grounds who pleases him, and she is obliged to come at night to redeem the pledge. Among Tibetans of this part of the country monogamy is the rule and polygamy the exception; but in other districts, where the struggle for existence is even more severe than among the flock-owning Tibetans of the Kokonor, the people reach a still lower social level, and, in common with

some few Himalayan tribes, follow the strange practice of polyandry. So intensely poverty-stricken are the natives of these regions that the men are quite incapable of supporting a wife apiece, and it is only by a combination among themselves that they can hope to secure the comforts of a home. As a rule, two or more brothers espouse one wife, and if there is any redeeming feature to be found in so degraded a compact, it is in the fact that the wife benefits by the efforts made by each of her husbands to recommend himself in her eyes. Both in the Himalayan region and in Tibet it has been observed by travellers that polyandrous wives are better dressed and cared for than the women of the monogamous section of the community. M. Bonvalot considers that the practice is fostered by the desire of the several men to live as much as possible upon the labour of their common wife. But he forgets that any such desire would directly promote monogamy, since one woman would obviously be better able to support one man than many.

It is at least certain that the relative position of women in Tibet is infinitely better than among polygamous races. So soon as a woman enters the house of her husband or husbands, she assumes the control of the affairs of his family. No sales or purchases are made without her consent and approval; and in all matters, from the choice of a camping ground to the exchange of a dog, her opinion is invited and followed. So completely does she take the position of the head of the family that the children are invariably spoken of as hers, partly no doubt from the uncertainty which exists as to their paternity. In the Chinese symbol for 'a clan,' or 'a family name,' which is composed of parts signifying born of a woman, a tradition of a similar state of society is preserved.

A like pre-eminence attaches to Tibetan women in political as in domestic life. Many have reigned as queens, and at the present day the principality of Pomo is governed by a female sovereign. Custom has, however, imposed one disadvantage on the sex. In a nation of priests it was plainly inconvenient that women should be allowed to upset the composure of the holy men by walking about with their faces uncovered, and it was therefore decreed that they should daub their features over with a thick black paste, composed of grease and cutch. This unguent serves the double purpose of preserving the face from the cutting winds and of concealing the charms of those who possess any.

Unlike the Scythian women described by Herodotus, who plastered their faces over with a sweet-smelling compound, which, when removed, left the skin clean and glossy, Tibetan women are condemned to a perpetual disfigurement, and wear their *teuja*, as they call it, as a Mahomedan wears her veil, and as a Japanese married woman blackens her teeth, or, rather, used to, for in Japan all things have become new.

The whole position of the sexes in Tibet is abnormal. It is reckoned that for every household in the country there are three lamas, and though all lamas are not bound to vows of celibacy, the greater number of them are. This absorption of the men necessitates a similar withdrawal of women from the active concerns of life, and consequently nunneries abound. The number of married people is therefore comparatively small, and as it rarely happens that there are more than four or five children in a family, the population does not show any tendency to increase. Mr. Rockhill estimates the present population at about 3,500,000 souls, and when the vast extent of the area occupied by this small number of inhabitants is considered, an idea can be gained of the unproductive barrenness of the soil.

As is always the case where an ecclesiastical polity holds sway, the great bulk of the property of the nation gravitates towards the priestly societies. The land in Tibet which is held by the lamas is enormous both in extent and value, and the serfs and bondsmen who owe them allegiance are counted by thousands. In many parts of the country these priests exercise judicial functions over their underlings and tenants, under commissions from the Talé Lama at Lh'asa; and though by faith and calling they profess to be consecrated to the cause of peace, necessity has compelled them to be ever ready to defend themselves in war. So constantly are they obliged to appeal to arms that, like the abodes of the Knight Templars, a lamasery is more like an armed camp than a monastery. All lamas are well armed and mounted, though a declaration of war is necessary to enable them to take to the saddle for any length of time. In peaceful days trousers do not form part of their apparel, and the first intimation that war is determined upon is given by the order to the lamas to convert their shawls into breeches, to enable them to undertake long marches on horseback.

But we have already kept Mr. Rockhill too long on the frontier, and we will now follow his fortunes into the unlovely country which he chose for his journey. At first the

route lay by the Kokonor, or 'Azure Lake,' about the formation of which so many legends linger on its shores. This vast inland sea, which is about two hundred and thirty miles in circumference, lies at an altitude of 10,900 feet above the sea level, and its glassy surface is broken only by one island, to which strange natural attributes are said to belong. On its northern and western sides it is surrounded by excellent grazing lands, which offer irresistible attractions to those nomads preparing to advance westward into the desert, as well as to those who have survived the miseries of a journey through that desolate region. Having secured a guide for the onward route, Mr. Rockhill again took the saddle, and advancing in the footprints of Huc and Gabet, arrived, as they did, at the banks of the 'Wild Yak' river. Readers of Huc's most interesting work will probably remember his very graphic description of the stream, with its twelve channels occupying a breadth of more than a league, and its awful appearance as the caravan approached its frozen waters in the blackness of the night. Turning from this account, and that of the stirring events which accompanied the crossing, to Mr. Rockhill's experiences, these last assume a very commonplace air. All the horrors of the passage have disappeared, and the stream, which was not more than forty feet wide and two feet deep, presents no difficulty to his horses and camels. He is careful, however, to point out that the bed of the river was considerably wider than the stream, and that it was probably still broader forty-five years ago. Colonel Prjevalsky is not so considerate, and, growing virtuously indignant at Huc's figurative narrative, throws considerable doubts upon the general veracity of his statements. He forgets that the abbé wrote from memory at an interval of some years, and he makes no allowance for his habit of decorating the features of his story in such a way as to add a picturesque interest to the bare record of travel. This kind of severe criticism cannot always be indulged in with safety, and were the abbé still alive he might, as Mr. Rockhill points out, return an effective '*tu quoque*' to his indignant critic. While crossing the desert of Ts'aidam the colonel's party were attacked by a band of robbers, and in writing an account of the adventure to the Czarewitch the colonel describes the charge of 'the bloodthirsty horde' with all the word-painting of Huc, and adds, with more than Huc-like picturesqueness, that as they rode down upon the travellers their commander cried aloud, 'Charge, charge! 'God is with us! He will help us!' It certainly was

presuming on the Czarewitch's ignorance of the habits of the nomads to expect him to believe that the chief thus invoked the aid of the Deity. As well may we be told that Western footpads are in the habit of firing their zeal by calling on the names of Buddha or Confucius. The colonel further adds that, having driven off the robbers, 'they opened fire upon us 'with their flint locks at 300 yards.' Now, in the first place, flint-lock guns are unknown to the Tibetans, who use only matchlocks, and as these do not under any circumstances carry more than 150 yards, the perils of the situation were not such as it was intended to convey.

The first few days of the onward march were through the Kokonor pasture lands, where the more favourable conditions of life affected advantageously the manners of the people, but with the advance into the Ts'aidam desert the physical and social surroundings became harsh and depressing.

'We travelled,' writes Mr. Rockhill, 'for four days in a south-westerly direction through this desert country, in one place sandy, in another boggy, stopping on the bank of some little stream or near a brackish pool where grew a coarse spear grass. The heat during the day was oppressive, the nights very cold; the alkaline dust raised by the shuffling feet of the camels stuck to our skins, which soon were cracked and bleeding.'

It need not be a matter of surprise that people living in such conditions should be morose and melancholic, as both Huc and Prjevalsky describe them to be. Mr. Rockhill takes a more favourable view of their character, and considers that they are not more taciturn and morose than nomads accustomed only to the sight of vast prairies and desolate plains must necessarily be. But, however this may be, they certainly present in every respect a complete contrast to their settled neighbours the Chinese, and more especially is this the case in the entire want of reverence they show towards their elders. Filial piety finds no place in their character. It is no uncommon thing for a son to turn his father, when too old to work, out of doors, and to leave him to perish in the cold. The superstition that the souls of the dead can, if they will, haunt the living, drives their hardened natures to gain by the exercise of cruelty the promise of the dying that they will not return to earth. As death approaches, the dying person is asked, 'Will you come back, or will you not?' If he replies that he will, they pull a leather bag over his head and smother him; if he says he will not, he is allowed to die in peace.

Notwithstanding these obliquities of character the people

are devoutly religious, and turn their praying wheels with an assiduity worthy of better things. They even place these strange vicarious petitioners on the roofs of their houses, that the passing breeze may reel out their requests and repeat their invocations. They attribute the highest virtues to holy water, and make their offerings for guilt with praiseworthy perseverance. The line of demarcation between religious observances of this sort and superstition is faint, and rites which in other lands would be regarded as idle fancies are elevated among the Tibetans to the level of sacred beliefs. The Abbé Huc was, he tells us, a spectator of a religious ceremony when from the summit of a mountain paper horses, tents, and provisions were scattered by the wind to help travellers over the dreary wastes of Tibet. The art of divination is looked upon as a hallowed calling, and professional fortune-tellers enjoy a reputation second only to that of priests. One member of this fraternity whom Mr. Rockhill consulted was interesting from the peculiarity of his appearance. Unlike the Tibetan people, he had 'a thin 'aquiline nose, large eyes, and a tangled mass of curly 'locks hanging over his shoulders and half hiding his face. 'He looked like a European in disguise, rather than an 'Asiatic.' Further observation showed that this type of features is not at all uncommon in Eastern Tibet, and M. Bonvalot mentions that he met natives in the neighbourhood of So, to the north-east of Lh'asa, having perfect Greek profiles. Ethnologists have yet before them the unsolved problem of the genesis of this very un-Eastern Asiatic type.

In their social observances the people are as far behind their neighbours as in their moral and religious practices. Their mode of salutation is so strange that if it were not attested by unimpeachable authorities it would scarcely be credited. 'They hold out both hands,' writes Mr. Rockhill, 'palms uppermost, bow with raised shoulders, stick out their 'tongues and say *Oji, Oji*. When desirous of showing 'respect to a person, or expressing thankfulness, they stick 'out their tongues and say *Kadri*.' In Central Tibet the protrusion of the tongue is accompanied by pulling the right ear and rubbing the left hip. The dirt of their persons and surroundings is phenomenal, and altogether their mode of life is little removed from that of the wild men who still haunt the forests in the eastern provinces.

Some idea of the weariness of the journey through the Ts'aidam desert may be gathered from the fact that the

sight of even such people as these was a welcome change. For the most part the country was abandoned to wild asses and antelopes, while a few prowling bears in search of broken-down beasts of burden deserted by travellers were occasionally met with. In this dreary region all the forces of nature appear to be in league against the advance of travellers. The height of the plateau and loftiness of the mountain passes are such that the air becomes rarefied to an extent which is scarcely endurable. Giddiness, shortness of breath, and nausea add their miseries to those already to be borne, while the continual wind, snow, and sleet cut and burn the skin and torture the eyes of those who are unwary enough to go without horsehair veils. One peculiarity of the rarefied air is that it is not in the most elevated localities that its effects are most painfully felt by either man or beast, and hence the belief has been engendered among the natives that it is the result of poisonous emanations from the soil. Huc was a supporter of this theory, and in his very graphic account of his passage of the Bourhan-Bota mountains describes how the vapour was nothing more than carbonic acid gas, which, being heavier than the atmosphere, condensed on the surface of the ground. As an evidence of this, he states that when lying on the ground respiration was much more difficult than when standing upright. Fortunately the abbé's fact is more trustworthy than his theory, and finds confirmation in Mr. Rockhill's experience that while at night snatches of sleep could be gained in a sitting attitude, the horizontal position was too painful to be endured.

The prospect of being able to reach Lh'asa had buoyed up Mr. Rockhill in his toilsome march through the desert, but on emerging from it he was doomed to find that his project was impracticable. The chief to whom he communicated his ambitious scheme raised no objection to it on principle, but proposed, through his steward, such vast sums as the wages of the necessary guides and followers that Mr. Rockhill was obliged to abandon the idea. Knowing the difficulty of reaching the capital, he had prepared alternative schemes. Lh'asa now being beyond his reach, his first desire was to make his way into Assam. But even this route was denied him, and he eventually determined to penetrate through Eastern Tibet to Tatsienlu, on the Chinese frontier.

Having engaged the chief's steward as his guide, and having bought new baggage animals, Mr. Rockhill started afresh on his new line of travel. From this point his difficulties, though by no means inconsiderable, were not so

intensely painful as they had been, and after a journey of about 200 miles he emerged from the purely nomadic country into more settled districts. At Takou he exchanged the canvas of his tent for the first house he had seen for months. Although not clean, it was an outward and visible sign of civilisation, which to a traveller accustomed only to the squalid tents of the desert was a welcome sight. It is necessary to remember what Mr. Rockhill had gone through in order to realise the pleasure he evidently felt at the view of this and the surrounding dwellings. As might be expected, these were mean and comfortless, and were, as is the case of most houses in this quarter of Tibet, built on a rocky ledge so as not to occupy any of the small extent of arable soil which is found in the district. Such houses commonly consist of several stories, to which access is obtained by means of notched logs set against the walls to serve as ladders. Of furniture there is none, nor are the people in a position to make any. The only tools they possess are adzes and axes, and for these they are dependent on the Chinese. Their wooden vessels, basket-ware, and bamboo utensils are all of Chinese manufacture, and the only art they can call their own is that of making pottery. In this they are skilful, and show some success in reproducing Indian and Chinese designs in the shapes of their teapots and bowls.

Over this part of Tibet the influence of China is rather shadowy than real. The country is possessed by eighteen distinct tribes, each of which is ruled over by a chief, who, on occasions, is complimented with the regal title by the Ministers of the Son of Heaven. By these chieftains the sovereign power is exercised with varying authority. Over the indolent and restless tribes which wander over the wild pastures on the north they have little control, but in the more settled districts a rude system of administration suffices to preserve the outward semblance of order. Such justice as is meted out to the people at all is directed by the light of nature, which burns with varying degrees of brightness in the breasts of the judges. Capital punishment is rarely inflicted, and as imprisonment is impossible in a country where there are no prisons, fines are the common penalties adjudged as the punishment for every crime from misdemeanour to murder. The scale of mulcts for the supreme crime is determined in accordance with the social standing of the victim, from the payment of two hundred or three hundred bricks of tea as expiation for the murder of a lama to that of three or four bricks for killing a beggar or a wander-

ing foreigner. The views of the people and their rulers on the relative ranks of the classes and position of the sexes are as undefined as are their ideas of right and wrong, and a tone of democratic equality prevails among all orders and degrees of the population. Densely ignorant, and for the most part unacquainted with the use of letters, they are deprived of that enlightening influence which raises a people above the rank of savages incapable of knowledge or reflection. As they are quite unaware of the real value of the products of the soil, and know nothing of weights and measures, they fall ready victims to Chinese traders, who prey upon their ignorance, and take as slaves those who by any chance become their debtors. In these oppressors of the poor the Christian missionaries find their most formidable opponents, since they are fully aware that their main profits would melt away were the people to taste of the tree of knowledge and learn to know the difference between good and evil.

The principal efforts of the Chinese Government are directed towards preserving its hold on the government of Lh'asa. In that sacred city resides the chief of the hierarchy which exercises authority over Central and Western Tibet. Surrounded by the mystery of religious seclusion, the Talé Lama is regarded by the people as the highest spiritual authority and the supreme ruler upon earth. For many centuries the holy light, which is now diffused from the Mountain of Buddha, where dwells this living divinity, has never entirely been allowed to fail. Temporal misfortunes have overtaken the kingdom and its hierarch, and even the spiritual existence of this potentate has at times been eclipsed, but it has always risen again to preserve the doctrines and wisdom of the great founder of the faith. Hue remarks at length on the very noticeable similarities between Lamaism and Roman Catholicism, and between the political history of Lh'asa and that of Rome. It is certainly true that in the records of Lh'asa there is much to remind one of the annals of the 'Mistress of the world.' Ecclesiastical governments must necessarily be under disabilities when surrounded by warlike peoples to whom their claims to spiritual dominion are things of naught; and Lh'asa, like Rome, has felt the heel of the conqueror whom no force of flesh at its command nor exercise of spiritual denunciation has been able to keep without its gates.

In such emergencies the Talé Lama has turned to Peking for help, and, with that desire to extend its political influence which has always marked the Government of China, the re-

quired help has on every occasion been forthcoming. In 1720 the Dzungarians attacked and took the sacred city, and held it until they in their turn were driven out by the Chinese. At that time the throne of China was occupied by one of the most enlightened sovereigns that has ever ruled the empire. The news of the irruption of the Dzungarians into the tributary state of Tibet determined the Emperor K'anghi to secure the stability of the country by converting it into a dependency of the crown, and in exchange for the ready and powerful assistance which he sent to Lh'asa he claimed the right to exercise a commanding voice in the council of the nation. Being powerless to resist, the Tibetans yielded to the demand, and the Emperor at once appointed an officer to reside at Lh'asa, whose duties were to be very similar to those of an English Resident at the court of a native Indian prince. He was to guide the foreign policy of the country, and was to have a voice in the appointment of the highest officials. Under the Emperor K'ienlung, the second in succession to K'anghi, the bonds between the two countries were drawn tighter, and since 1793 the Imperial Ambans have practically ruled Tibet. The election of the Talé Lama even cannot be announced until the Amban has reported on the choice to Peking and a confirmation of the appointment has been received in return. In like manner, all ecclesiastical appointments have to be approved by the Emperor before they can be recognised as valid, and no edict can become law without the sanction of the Amban. As the Talé Lama is too purely a spiritual ruler to take an active part in matters of administration, his mundane powers are delegated to a viceroy, who holds very much the same position with regard to the Talé Lama that the Shoguns of Japan used to occupy in relation to the Mikado. As it is of primary importance that this office should never be allowed to lapse, even for a day, the heir presumptive to the vicereignty, commonly an infant, is elected at the same time as the viceroy himself; and lest any rivalry should spring up between the viceroy *in esse* and the viceroy *in futuro*, the 'understudy' is kept in strict seclusion until the death of his colleague, when he at once takes up the reins of government.

The viceroy's government consists of six ministers, who regulate the departments of finance, justice, revenue, home affairs, and ecclesiastical matters. Practically, however, the Chinese Ambans are the rulers of the country, and our admiration of their diplomatic skill is excited when we learn

that they are supported by only 4,500 men in all the garrisons of Tibet.

But, to return to Mr. Rockhill. After leaving Takou he travelled to Jyékundo, where he would willingly have rested, had not the hostile action of the local chief compelled him to leave the town and to push on with all haste in the direction of Tatsiculu. As he advanced towards the Chinese frontier, the bare and bleak aspect of the country began to relax its features, and in the Drenkon Valley

'the scenery changed as if by magic. A brook flowed down the glen, its banks covered with soft green grass, powdered over with white and pink flowers. On the mountain sides grew juniper and pine trees, and by the roadside were wild plum, gooseberry, honeysuckle, and other shrubs, the fragrance of their blossoms filling the air. From cavities in the tufa rocks pended creepers and ferns, from which the water fell in crystal drops; and we heard the cuckoo's cry echoing across the valley. We were filled with amazement and delight; even my stolid Chinese showed their admiration for this lovely scenery.'

From this point onward the journey was comparatively easy, and Mr. Rockhill was able to proceed without let or hindrance to Tatsienlu. There he was cordially received by Mgr. Biet, the Roman Catholic bishop, who extended to him all the hospitable care which he so much needed. For the rest, his way lay over the well-trodden paths of Central China, and he eventually reached Shanghai exactly eight months from the day on which he had started from Peking.

We cannot take leave of Mr. Rockhill's most interesting book without expressing our admiration at the courage, wisdom, and endurance which enabled him to accomplish this most difficult and dangerous journey, which, though falling short of his highest ambition, has yet been fruitful in bringing to our knowledge a vast array of new and well-authenticated facts about the land and the people of Tibet.

- ART. XI.—1. *Letters on Home Rule.* By JOHN BRIGHT, the People's Tribune. Published by the Daily Gazette Company (Limited). Birmingham: 1892.
2. *Speech of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., in the House of Commons, on the Address to the Queen's Speech, February 11, 1892.* Hansard's Debates.
3. *The Right Hon. G. Goschen, M.P., at Islington.* 'Times,' March 16, 1892.

MR. GLADSTONE will, his friends tell us, at the coming general election, get a majority. What will he do with it?

The condition of political parties at the present time is a strange one. In some respects the situation is without precedent in the modern history of the country. We have been long accustomed to the rivalry and keen contests of great parties; and it is natural and usual that after one party has been in power for several years, the other should reckon confidently, and often with good reason, on the result of an appeal to the people to turn the balance once more in its favour. Hitherto, however, the rivalry has been between two well-defined and organised parties, each based upon recognised political principles, each led by a statesman, or a group of statesmen, imbued with a high sense of responsibility to the country, statesmen who were seeking power by teaching the people to understand and adopt the policy which they professed. Especially has this been true of the Liberal party, whose greatest leaders in the past have triumphed by the persistency with which they explained their views, and urged their policy upon the public mind and conscience.

Catholic Emancipation, and Reform, and Free Trade, were advocated on their own merits, not merely adopted as electioneering cries by politicians in distress. A general election may be won by a cry; but a party, if it is to have any stability, if it is to have any power, must rest upon some principle.

Does the Opposition constitute a party at all? Can the gentlemen sitting on the Speaker's left hand be described with truth, in the words of Burke, as 'a body of men united for promoting, by their joint endeavours, the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed'? Upon what 'particular principle' are they all agreed? Irish separatists, Welsh disestablishers, English and Scotch Gladstonians, are, doubtless, united in a common

wish to overthrow the present Government, but, to all appearance, this is the only aim they have in common. A success achieved at the polls under these conditions may be, nay, must be, the prelude to fresh dissension in their own ranks, and to the introduction of much confusion into the government of the country.

We are on the eve of a general election. Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues are already counting upon success; yet not one of them seems to have the slightest idea of what a Gladstonian success will mean. In England and Scotland it seems to be sufficient at elections to conjure with the name of 'Liberal,' and, if it is necessary to mention, never to forget at the same time to minimise 'Home Rule.' A year and a half ago we endeavoured, with but little success, to discover in what consisted the principles of the self-styled Liberal party. Assuredly they are not the principles professed by the statesmen, from Lord Grey to Mr. John Bright, whose names have been held in the highest honour by Liberals of every degree, from the moderate Whig to the advanced Radical. Yet, perhaps, the word 'Liberal' for electioneering purposes grows in power as it loses in meaning; and it is to its electioneering tactics, not to its political principles, that the Opposition looks to achieve a victory.

If Mr. Gladstone obtains a majority, what will he do with it? The Tapers and Tadpoles of his party -- and never was a party richer in Tapers and in Tadpoles -- are already employing their leisure in the construction of a new Cabinet, and in awarding subordinate offices amongst the many applicants for the favour of Gladstonian patronage: matters of much interest to the hangers-on of the party, but of less importance to the general public. Is there to be a general reversal of the political system of the present Government? The country does not desire this, as it knows that its foreign policy, its financial policy, and its general domestic policy and administration, have all been singularly successful. Yet, if Lord Salisbury is exchanged for Mr. Gladstone, at once our foreign relations, which have become heartily cordial with the Powers of Europe, which have tended steadily to the maintenance of peace, will suffer a heavy shock. Lord Salisbury's foreign policy is understood, both at home and abroad; no one can answer for Mr. Gladstone's. The evacuation of Egypt, before Egypt can stand upon its own feet, would at once plunge that country into fresh difficulties, and might, not improbably, again reopen the Eastern question

amongst the great Powers of Europe. Yet, if words have meaning, Mr. Gladstone, at Newcastle, advised the immediate evacuation of Egypt. He was so understood on the Continent, and on the platforms of his adherents at home. Mr. Morley has since given a halting explanation of his leader's language. But Mr. Morley himself, not to mention a hardly less powerful member of his party, Mr. Labouchere, has never disguised his eagerness to fly from all those responsibilities towards Egypt which our own conduct has created for us. Outside the ranks of professional politicians, there are probably not half a dozen educated men in England who would not, in the interests of their country, regret the termination of Lord Salisbury's rule at the Foreign Office.

Again, if Mr. Goschen is to leave the Exchequer, is the nation likely to be a gainer by the transference of the guardianship of the public purse to Sir William Harcourt, or to Mr. Fowler? Mr. Goschen's five years of office have witnessed a reduction of debt, and a lightening of taxation, without parallel in any previous period of the same length. Yet the lightening of the burdens on the people has not been accompanied by the starvation of the services; and never before has the nation rendered from its imperial resources such generous contributions to local ratepayers. The establishment of free primary education has entailed a cost of nearly two millions annually upon the nation, yet for this also Mr. Goschen has found the money, notwithstanding his steady reduction of taxation.

The truth is, that the country is not prepared to tolerate any great departure from the lines of the present Government in the great subjects of foreign policy and finance. Should Mr. Gladstone succeed to power, it is the hope, undoubtedly of the most responsible of his own followers, that Lord Rosebery will follow in the footsteps of Lord Salisbury, and his Chancellor of the Exchequer in those of Mr. Goschen. The competence of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues to do this, the willingness of their party as a whole to allow this, may doubt; but few persons really question that the interests of the country require the perseverance of the nation in the same path upon which during the last few years it has been safely guided by the present Ministry.

Neither can it be seriously maintained that the legislation of the last six years has been distasteful to the country, or that the people have the slightest intention of condemning it. The conversion of the national debt, the establishment of representative government in the counties of Great

Britain, the building up of a peasant proprietary in Ireland, could only have been successfully attempted by an able Ministry, heartily supported by the House of Commons. The Opposition, when it dared not openly resist, has endeavoured by indirect means to wreck the measures of the Government. In the session of 1890, the tactics of the former for the time prevailed; but fresh energy on the part of the majority has enabled them to overcome all resistance, and to give legislative effect to policy undoubtedly approved by the country. The truth is, that if we take a comprehensive view of the history of the last six years, turning our eyes away from the contests of the House of Commons, often of ephemeral interest, to the general tendency and drift of public opinion out of doors, we cannot fail to discern how spiritless has been the popular opposition to the Government, except upon one subject. For a time the question of 'coercion' in Ireland did keenly divide men's feelings, and Mr. Gladstone, unequalled in the faculty of detecting the slightest spark of genuine enthusiasm, and unequalled also in the power of fanning the spark into a flame, seized the opportunity with a zeal akin to that which roused the country to frenzy in the days of Bulgarian atrocities. 'Remember Mitchelstown' was to be the watchword with which an indignant people were to sweep into ignominious extinction the brutal oppressors of the Irish people. It is not a watchword which will be heard upon a single platform at the approaching general election. 'Mitchelstown' has been long forgotten. The only genuine popular battle has been lost and won. The misrepresentations by Irish members of Mr. Balfour's oppression were exposed, as completely as the no less grave misrepresentations by Gladstonian statesmen of the nature of the Coercion Act. Law was vindicated, order was maintained, and the most vilified member of the Cabinet has become the leader of the House of Commons, the most powerful member of the Conservative party, and by universal consent one of the most popular and respected statesmen of the day.

Few Governments, after so long a period of power, have had such a good record to point to as the existing Ministry can show. Mr. Goschen, in vindicating his own finance from the charge made by his opponents that he had frittered away his surpluses, has only to ask the question, in what direction has he frittered? To reduce the income tax by 2*d.*, the tea duty by one-third, the tobacco duty by 4*d.*, to take the duty off workmen's houses when of less value than

20*l.* a year, and to diminish it on houses of less value than 60*l.* a year, to reduce the duty on currants and raisins from 7*s.* to 2*s.* per cwt., is to have accomplished work which has very greatly lightened the burdens of the people. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, showing his customary courage when dealing with popular audiences, put forward in the same speech another claim to public gratitude—viz. that he has been able to lay on new taxes, thereby putting at the service of the State new sources of supply in case of future necessity. The mere 'turn of the screw' by which the income tax is increased is the simplest of all expedients to which a Chancellor of the Exchequer can have recourse. Mr. Goschen has, however, again expressed his dislike to confining the means of expansion of our national income to operations on the income tax. It is not, however, on finance alone that the coming appeal by the Unionist Ministry to the people of the United Kingdom is to be made. 'We intend to go to the country upon that which, during the last five or six years, we have been able to perform. We shall go to the country upon our foreign policy as well; we shall go to the country upon a strengthened navy and upon a sounder army; we shall go to the country upon an administration of our affairs which, in the unparalleled opposition which we have met with during the past six years, we think will not disgrace the men who have entrusted us with their confidence.'

Successful finance is dependent on successful administration in other departments. Economies cannot be effected if the blunders of the Foreign Office or the Colonial Office have necessitated great expenditure, or kept the nation on strained terms with its neighbours.

It is unnecessary here to go into any detail as to the legislative programme of the Government. Their policy is put before the country, not in vague phrases or attractive promises, but in the concrete form of bills which they are inviting Parliament to pass into law. They propose to give to Irish counties substantially the same powers of local representative government that have been given to English and Scotch counties, the Irish Bill differing only from the Acts affecting Great Britain in the provisions deemed necessary to prevent an abuse of these powers by the spirit of faction so lamentably prevalent in Ireland. The Government propose to encourage, and to assist with public money, the establishment of a class of yeomen farmers in Great Britain; and they propose, too, with regard to Scotland and

Ireland, to substitute local inquiry in matters of private bill legislation for the costly and distant investigations now held before parliamentary committees at Westminster.

Let us turn from the Government to the Opposition. To what part of the past policy of the Ministry, to what part of its present programme, is Mr. Gladstone opposed ? As we have seen, the past policy of the Government has not been met by open opposition, so much as by tactics of delay and of obstruction. The effort has been to weary the Ministry, so to prolong discussion as to necessitate the dropping of measures, and then to describe the Government to the constituencies as a Ministry incapable of legislation. All this has failed, for the principal measures proposed by the Government have been passed, and, for their own sakes, the Opposition dare not on public platforms attack Acts of Parliament which they know have the full approbation of the people. The Opposition, then, if they are to prevail with the constituencies, must succeed by virtue of the merits or attractiveness of their own programme, since the Government, after six years of office, are in the singularly fortunate condition of having offered no ground for vigorous criticism which finds favour with the general public.

Before seeking an answer to the question what is the programme of the Opposition, let us consider, first of all, what is the composition of the party which faces the Government in the House of Commons, and which hopes to take its place. Mr. Gladstone is titularly, but not in fact, the leader of the Opposition. His great age, his unequalled experience, his splendid abilities, his unwearied energy, and the high respect in which his character is held in the country, give him, in appearance, a personal ascendancy and a conspicuous position, which are too apt to be mistaken for real power. A rider sometimes remains erect in the saddle long after he has lost control of the reins. His steed has run away with him, and though when looked at from a distance the real state of affairs may not be perceived, a nearer view discloses the imminent peril that is awaiting them both. Mr. Gladstone no longer leads by virtue of impressing himself upon his following. That is to say, he does not lead in the sense in which he led the Liberal party ten years ago, in the sense in which Lord Hartington has led so large a share of the substantial liberalism of the country for the last six years, still less in the sense in which Mr. Parnell led the majority of the Irish people towards his ideal of an independent Irish nation. The political ideals in the minds of Gladstonians are not the

political ideals of Mr. Gladstone. Whether it be the dis-establishment of the Church, the payment of members, or other of 'the planks' of the elaborate 'platform' constructed at Newcastle last October, even whilst accepting them, the leader of the Liberal party does not affect the slightest personal desire to forward their accomplishment. It will be the business of others, not of himself, so he seems to say, to bring these matters to a conclusion. There is one question only for which he cares. If those who are striving for other ends will but help him to attain his own, he will be satisfied. The responsibility for everything else rests with others, not with him. And so it comes to pass that, for the time being, those who arrogate to themselves the name of the Liberal party are without a responsible leader. In the daily parliamentary life of the party the same unsatisfactory state of things is apparent. In the inevitable 'hitches' that arise in the progress of business, in the making of arrangements between the two Front Benches, that often do so much to facilitate the work of the House of Commons, members on both sides have continually to deplore the absence of the leader of the Opposition. Let us look facts fairly in the face. The victory of the Gladstonian party at the polls will not entail the placing in power of *Mr. Gladstone*. His name, his fame, his character, and his authority, are to be made use of to secure the power of others, and the accomplishment of objects other than those upon which he has set his heart. The Liberal and Radical party are, in the nature of things, always straining towards the future. Can a statesman in his eighty-third year, immeasurably superior though he be to those by whom he is surrounded, be, in fact, a *responsible* leader for a party which prides itself upon being pre-eminently the party of the future? Whether it suits some paltry party ends, whether it suits the special views of individuals, that the Liberal party should be led, in appearance, by a statesman who is not responsible, we forbear to inquire. That such leadership is injurious to the best interests of the country it is impossible to deny.

From Mr. Gladstone let us turn to the Gladstonians. In the present House, the English and Scotch Home Rule members number about two hundred, the Irish eighty-four. It is hardly yet realised in the country, though it is universally recognised in the House of Commons, how slight is the authority which Mr. Gladstone now wields even over the two hundred British Gladstonian members. It is quite certain that were any difference to arise between Mr. Glad-

stone and Mr. Labouchere, representing the more and the less moderate sections of the party, the following of the latter would be larger than that of the former; and because the action of Mr. Labouchere would be the more extravagant or even outrageous course, he would always be able to count upon the support of the Irish party as well as on that of his own followers. The extreme Radicals, now for the first time organised and officered, apart from the more moderate and ex-official Home Rulers, and the representatives of gallant little Wales, fired with a desire to imitate the tactics of Irish Nationalists, have no notion of bowing down before what they look upon as the effete whiggism of the Front Opposition Bench. When a few weeks ago the Welsh members proposed to introduce the system of the Irish Land Act, fixity of tenure, fair-rent courts, and all the rest of it, into Wales, the strongest remonstrances of Mr. Gladstone and his whips were disregarded. A division was taken, and the so-called leader of the Opposition led into the lobby with him hardly more than the little band of subordinate ex-officials, and by no means all even of these.

The parliamentary opposition to the present Government comes not so much from a party as from a number of groups, forced into co-operation by their hostility to the Ministry, but not welded by community of political principles into what has hitherto in this country been considered a political party. It is Mr. Gladstone's name, bright from his past achievements, and not his power of leadership in present difficulties, which is expected to rally against the Unionist party, in the coming Parliament, a majority composed of the heterogeneous elements of which we have spoken. To what does all this tend? Granted, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Gladstone will get a majority. What will he do with it? Elements, which in combination are strong enough to harass a Ministry, may possibly be found insufficient to sustain a Government.

There is, however, supposed to be one policy to which the whole of the various sections of the Opposition are firmly attached. It is this which is to make their opposition triumphant, and their majority (when they get it) a success. Once more, let us speak plainly. We have shown that there is no reality in the authority of the Home Rule leader. We maintain, further, that there is no reality in the policy of Home Rule. Home Rule as a cry for an Opposition, is one thing; Home Rule as a definite policy to be carried out by a Government, is another thing. We believe that those who

are trying to construct a party by virtue of the name of Mr. Gladstone, and the policy of Home Rule, will find, if ever they acquire power, that they have built on treacherous foundations, and that neither the one nor the other will support them.

The greatest question of all remains. Supposing that Mr. Gladstone obtains a Home Rule majority, what will he do with Home Rule? It is the desire to establish Home Rule in Ireland which is supposed to bind together the various bands of Opposition members into one army. In what way, then, is Mr. Gladstone to accomplish the one political object for which alone he appears to believe that his own leadership exists, and for which all devout Gladstonians in 1886 began so suddenly and so energetically to pray?

There is no doubt that at first and for a time the more timid amongst his English followers found comfort in the thought, that the constitutional changes necessarily involved in any system of Home Rule had been magnified by Unionists in order to increase its terrors, and that in the end Mr. Gladstone's plan would turn out to be little more than is usually meant by the expression 'local government.' Some Gladstonian newspapers, at the opening of the present session, pretended to believe (we have too much respect for their good sense to suppose the belief was genuine) that Mr. Balfour's Irish Local Government Bill would disclose the Unionist Government and party as, in fact, Home Rulers! Of course, in reality the two things 'Home Rule' and 'Local Government' are fundamentally different; and surely at the present day every Home Ruler is aware that, whatever else Home Rule may mean, it necessarily involves the establishment in Dublin of a National Democratic Parliament, with an Irish Executive Government absolutely dependent upon it. It involves, therefore, the creation of such a condition of 'separation' between the systems of government of these two islands as has never yet either existed in fact or been contemplated as a possibility by British statesmen. Grattan's Parliament, constitutionally independent of the control of the British Parliament, was swayed, and Ireland was governed, by an Executive which was, in fact, nothing more than a branch of the king's Administration in London. The Irish policy of the Opposition means 'Repeal of the Union,' and something more, for it contemplates the creation not merely of two Legislatures, but of a National Irish Executive Government, amenable only to the Parliament of Ireland, which is

to govern the Irish 'Nation.' Yet Home Rulers, when on English platforms, fear nothing more than the charge of being 'Repealers' or Separatists!

Mr. Chamberlain, on February 11, in the debate on the address, amply justified his selection on the previous day by Liberal Unionist members of the House of Commons as their leader in this great controversy. Does the Opposition intend to establish in Ireland an independent or a subordinate Parliament? That question was the burden of his speech. In January of last year Mr. Parnell at Waterford, and again six months later in Dublin, had declared his views. Mr. Chamberlain quoted his very words: 'It is now known to all men that when our Parliament has been restored to us it shall have power to make laws for Ireland, and that there shall be no English veto upon those laws, except the constitutional veto of the Crown, exercised in the same way as in the Imperial Parliament.' This language, Mr. Chamberlain pointed out, had been fully approved by the Irish Nationalists who professed to follow the lead of Mr. Justin M'Carthy. Again and again Mr. Gladstone had declared that he was prepared to satisfy the demands of the representatives of the Irish people. Then turning to Sir William Harcourt, who, in the absence of Mr. Gladstone, was acting as the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chamberlain quoted to him the words of his speech of April 17, as follows: 'The principle for which the Liberal party had contended,' said Sir William Harcourt, 'had been the right of the Irish people to manage their own affairs, subject—always subject—to the control of the Imperial Parliament. That was the principle they had always proclaimed and depended upon, and that was the principle upon which they would always stand.' What was the House of Commons, what was the public, to understand? 'Will the right hon. member for Derby,' Mr. Chamberlain asks him to his face, 'say now whether he now sticks to his declaration that there shall be the control of the Imperial Parliament, or does he mean to surrender that as he has surrendered so much else?' Sir William Harcourt made no reply, and every other leader and follower in the Gladstonian army held his peace!

What does this mean? The Home Rule party is going to the country with the cry of 'Home Rule,' and the Home Rule leaders dare not indicate to the people even the outlines of their Home Rule policy. It is, of course, not easy to reason against 'a cry'! Unionist statesmen have

encountered Home Rule in various forms. As a Bill, they riddled it with criticism and argument. They destroyed it. As a policy, their opponents are now afraid to discuss it, having no desire that their projects should once more be exposed to the test of hostile criticism. As a 'cry' it remains. A cry may serve an Opposition for the moment; it may win a majority for Mr. Gladstone at a general election. But what then? What progress is made towards the settlement of a problem, admitted by Home Rulers themselves to be a difficult one, by all their shouting and waving of flags? 'Home Rule' may be a good phrase, and Gladstone be a name to conjure with. Nevertheless, Home Rulers if they get a majority will find that it is with more than phrases and names that they must reckon. The Liberal party, they assure us, has in the past always been victorious. Was it the name of Liberal, do they suppose, that brought it victory, or the fact that the thing that name represented was a policy suited to the exigencies of the time and to the enlightened desires of the people?

The notion of establishing two 'National' Governments in the British Islands is a notion almost ludicrously opposed to the conditions of the present age, and no one knows better than the Home Rule leader himself how little he can rely for support on the old strongholds of Liberal opinion. The Irish outside Ulster, the Scottish crofters, and the peasantry of Wales combine to bring him strength. At the last general election England declared in favour of the Union by nearly three to one. Mr. Gladstone gives up, in apparent despair, all hope of recalling to his standard a large following of educated men in any of the three kingdoms. An educated middle class was long the backbone of Liberalism, but it is to 'the masses' only that he now appeals for help. In Ireland, Scotland, and Wales local pride or patriotism is made to serve the baser purposes of party. An anti-English feeling is to be created and to be sedulously fanned, in the hope that a policy which reason has wrecked may prevail through prejudice. Will arts of this kind, even if they prevail for the moment, make government easy in the future, or make even the passage of a Home Rule Bill a simple matter? We willingly turn from tactics such as these to the manly utterances of a great statesman.

The publication for general circulation of the collected letters of Mr. John Bright on Home Rule is exceedingly well timed. His sympathy with Ireland, his love of justice and peace, his affection for the Liberal party, and his distress

at its humiliation, are expressed in a series of letters which may be read to-day with as much advantage as on the day they were written,

'It is,' he writes in May 1886, 'my sympathy with Ireland, North and South, which compels me to condemn the proposed legislation. I believe the United Parliament can be and will be more just to all classes in Ireland than any Parliament that can meet in Dublin under the provisions of Mr. Gladstone's Bill.' . . . 'I am asked,' he writes in March 1887, 'why I cannot trust the Irish leaders. I do trust them most entirely. I have seen their course for seven years past, and have heard and read their speeches. I believe in those speeches, and see in them only hatred to England and disloyalty to the Crown, and I am unwilling to entrust to their tender mercies any portion of the population now under the government of the Imperial Parliament.'

In July of the latter year, when Sir George Trevelyan was standing for Glasgow against Mr. Evelyn Ashley, Mr. Bright wrote as follows:—

'I value the Liberal party, and have worked much longer for it and with it than either Mr. Gladstone or Sir George Trevelyan has done, but I will not follow a majority of the party led by a statesman whose Irish policy little more than a year ago the whole party almost unanimously condemned. Mr. Gladstone has led the Liberal party into difficulty and danger. The country will not let him go forward, and Mr. Parnell will not let him go back. Of the future it is difficult to speak, but to my view our duty is clear. . . . The Irish policy of Mr. Gladstone tends only to confusion and danger.'

* In October 1887, he declares that his sympathy for Ireland

'was not born of faction and a struggle for office and pay and pension. The leaders [of the bulk of the Liberal party, forgetting whatever is honourable in its past history, ask their followers to march in a path which can lead only to party disgrace and national disaster. I would save the Liberal party, with which I have been much longer associated, and for which I have worked more than any of its present acting leaders, from the humiliation with which it is threatened; and I would with my sympathy for Ireland save its population from the future conduct of the men who are answerable for much of its present sufferings, and for all the disorder by which it is now afflicted and disgraced. There are two millions of loyal people in Ireland. Let us be firm in our resolve, if it be possible, as I believe it is possible, not to sever them from the guardianship of the Crown of the United Kingdom, and from the shelter of the justice of the Imperial Parliament.'

Again in Letter XXIV., dated October 3, 1887:—

'For myself I do not discuss the question of a little more or a little less of a Parliament in Dublin. A Parliament is a great weapon if once created and opened—not difficult to form, but dangerous to deal with;

and to set up a Dublin Parliament now would make Mr. Parnell one of the Prime Ministers of the Queen, at least nominally of the Queen. . . . His right hand clasps the hand of Mr. Gladstone on this side of the Atlantic, and with the other he maintains a fraternal greeting with the gang in New York by whom outrage and murder were and are deemed patriotism in Ireland, and who collect the funds out of which more than half the Irish party in the Parliament at Westminster receive their weekly and monthly pay to insult the Speaker and make useful legislation impossible.

* Mr. Gladstone tells us that a preliminary condition as to the future Irish measure is that it must be satisfactory to Ireland—meaning Mr. Parnell. Thus his coming Bill or Bills must run on the lines of the leader of the section of the House who are paid to play at rebellion in Ireland, and to discredit the Parliament of Great Britain.*

We have given a few extracts from these most telling letters of a great Liberal statesman. In every one of them Mr. Bright goes straight to the root of the matter. What *he* means, at all events, is never left uncertain or vague for a moment. What would he have said now, when it is clear that an attempt is to be made to gain a popular majority in favour of Home Rule without first explaining it to the people? The dishonesty of such a proceeding, the distrust of the people that it manifests, the want of confidence in their own plans thus displayed by Home Rule leaders themselves, would have revolted the straightforward nature of 'the People's Tribune,' as it revolts many of the strongest Liberals of the day. As Mr. Bright said, 'of the future it is difficult to speak, but our duty is clear.' We insist that the British people have a right to know before the general election what are those projects for remodelling the British Constitution which Mr. Gladstone describes by the name of 'Home Rule.' If this knowledge is denied them, a Home Rule majority thus immorally obtained will assuredly be found to have no moral authority with the people. If the Home Rule party is an honest party, if those who lead it are not merely office seekers, but statesmen, the obtaining of a majority is only a step on their way. Their end is the passing into law of a satisfactory Home Rule Bill. Yet the leaders of the party rigidly shut their eyes to everything but the first step. To the future they prefer to remain blind, and they insist upon keeping the few of their followers who are seeking light in similar darkness. How long can this last? We hold with Mr. Bright that 'the path can lead only to party disgrace and national disaster.' It is because the people would see this, if they could look beyond the first step, that the word has gone forth that they are to be told

nothing. Let Home Rule remain a phrase then, for if it becomes a policy these wicked Unionists will once more knock it to pieces!

Mr. Gladstone has got himself and his party into an *impasse*. 'The country will not let him go forward, and the 'Irish Nationalists will not let him go back.' So stands at the present moment 'Home Rule,' and there let us leave it! We have discussed the merits of a Home Rule policy too often to wish to discuss it again at the present time. But do not let there be any mistake. A National Democratic Irish Parliament and Executive Government, if created, cannot in the nature of things, whatever safeguards may be introduced, be in truth 'subordinate' to a Parliament at Westminster. The colonial Parliaments are, in fact, independent, though in theory their 'subordination' to Westminster is, of course, complete. It is strange that Radicals, of all men, should forget, that in these democratic days it is with National Parliaments that sovereignty rests. The question between the Home Ruler and the Unionist is not, therefore, one of degree, one of safeguards, one of the presence or absence of an imperial parliamentary veto; it is the question whether there shall be more than one National Parliament and National Government within the limits of the United Kingdom. On this question the minds of Unionists are made up; and they hold their faith with the certainty that it will ultimately prevail.

If then Mr. Gladstone gains his majority, what will he do with it? We feel the utmost confidence that no Parliament elected in the dark will consent to sever into two portions the National Parliamentary Government of the United Kingdom. The Gladstonian party is without a practical policy; for Home Rule is not merely a policy to which it is impossible to give legitimate effect. It is a policy which has not yet become strong enough to bear the light of day. Yet it is upon this precious policy alone that Gladstonians are all agreed! And they are all agreed upon it simply because they do not know what it is. Can such a majority succeed in governing the State? Was such an exhibition of party incompetence ever before witnessed in our long history of party conflicts? And who is the future leader of the party? Mr. Gladstone has for all purposes, save one, already thrown down the reins. It is notorious that he has but little sympathy with 'New Radicalism.' He is not a hearty disestablisher. On the division on the second reading of the Eight Hours Bill for Miners he walks out of the House; on the question of payment of members of Parlia-

ment he absents himself from both the debate and the division. This is not leading. Who leads?

At the present moment the Opposition is to be commiserated. It has neither a leader to whom it can trust its future, nor a policy which it can avow. If it triumphs at the polls, it will be a triumph under conditions which cannot give it power. It may create—indeed, if Mr. Gladstone succeeds, it must create—much confusion, in Ireland and elsewhere. There is in truth but one organised party in the State, such as we have hitherto known parties. The choice for the electors lies between this party and confusion.

There are amongst us politicians whose forecasts of the future are confined to the most uncertain of all studies, the calculation of electoral chances—the science of political meteorology. For these persons it is enough to count upon a majority. How that majority may be composed, and in what way it may have been obtained, are inquiries beyond the range of vision of the party wire-puller. Yet these things are of the utmost importance. To carry a few county seats by the free use of those great weapons of the modern rural electioneerer, the peripatetic van and the magic-lantern, is not to carry Home Rule. Much of the loose language of the platform, after having served its purpose, will be forgotten. But the people of the United Kingdom will remain face to face with serious fact. Are the men of Ulster to be cast out from the protection of the Parliament of the United Kingdom; and to be subjected to men whom Englishmen and Scotchmen would scorn to obey? Are the people of the United Kingdom to constitute one nation, or are they to be broken up into two nations? Where the British Parliament denies the protection of its laws, has it a moral right to look for allegiance? If the Home Rule party gains a majority, it will be necessary for its leader to answer these questions. They are questions which Mr. Gladstone cannot answer now, and which he will be as little able to answer six months or a year hence. It is the intention of Gladstonians that Mr. Gladstone should win for them their majority. It will not be in his power effectively to employ it in the realisation of his own political ideals. To whom will he hand over the mighty instrument of a Parliamentary majority? For what purposes will that majority be employed? Verily, for the Gladstonian party, and (should it win) for the country, the coming dissolution is a ‘leap in the dark.’

INDEX.

A

Argyll, Duke of, speech at Manchester reviewed, 274.

B

Balfour, A. J., review of speech at Plymouth, 274.

Bull, Sir R. S., his book on 'Cause of Ice Age' reviewed, 297.

Beasts and Reptiles of India, review of works on, 469—Hindu treatment of, 471—gibbons, or long-armed apes, 472—sacred monkey, 473—Bengal monkey, 475—Wanderoo monkey, 476—tigers, 476—leopards and chetahs, 478—bears, 479—sloth bear, 480—wolves, jackals, and dogs, 480—elephants, 481—Brahminy cattle, 484—horses, 486—wild ass, 488—wild oxen, sheep, and goats, 488—deer, 489—wild pigs, 490—rhinoceros, 491—bats, 491—vampire, 492—reptiles, 493—superstitions regarding, 496.

Blanford, W. T., his book on Mammalia of India reviewed, 469.

Bonvalot, G., his account of journey across Tibet reviewed, 540.

Borgo, Count C. Pozzo di, his correspondence reviewed, 1—parentage, 2—represents Corsica in French Assembly, 3—returns to Corsica during the Terror, 4—proscribed by the Bonapartes, 5—supported by the Corsicans, 6—Corsica handed over to the British, 7— island retaken by the French, 8—Pozzo a fugitive in London, 9— accompanies the British Envoy to Vienna, 9—services accepted by Russia, 10—again at Vienna, 13—takes refuge in England, 14—recalled by the Czar and sent on a mission to Sweden, 15—mission to England and to Paris, 16—summoned to Vienna, 19—his opinion of Fouché, 21—with Wellington after Waterloo, 23—overtures from Talleyrand, 25—offers from King Louis, 26—his policy of alliance between France and Russia, 29—transferred to Russian Embassy in London, 31—private life and friendships, 32—his character, 33.

Bright, John, his 'Letters on Home Rule' reviewed, 559.

Butler, A. J., his translations of General Marbot's memoirs reviewed, 435.

C

Catherine of Aragon, review of Mr. Froude's book on, 201—the Pope's breve for her marriage with King Henry VIII., 206—pretended Papal dispensation, 208—document of Cranmer concerning proposed divorce, 212—birth of Mary, 214—Henry's reasons for desiring divorce, 215—mission of Chapuys, 217—alleged dangers

of a rising in her favour, 219—nature of her previous marriage with Henry's brother Arthur, 222—Pope's bull against the divorce, 223—threatened insurrection, 224—Henry's treatment of her, and murder of More and Fisher, 225—her death, and fall of her rival, 228—Pilgrimage of Grace, 231.

Chamberlain, J., speech on the Address reviewed, 559.

D

Dasent, J. R., his edition of 'Acts of Privy Council' reviewed, 145.

'*David Grieve*,' by Mrs. Humphry Ward, reviewed, 518—defects of religious novels, 519—outline of plot, 521—treatment of character, 522—merits as a work of art examined, 521—contrast with Miss Austen's works, 525—comparison with writings of the Brontës, 527; and with George Eliot's works, 531—sketch of principal character, 535—didactic purpose, 536.

Dollinger, Ignatius von, review of life and writings of, 48—early days, 50—predilection for theology, 51—professor at Munich, 52—modification of his Ultramontanist, 53—theory of Doctrinal Development, 54—attitude towards Vatican Council, 57—letters on Vatican decrees, 59—organisation of Council, 61—Papal Infallibility, 62—arguments against new dogma, 63—public refusal to accept the dogma, 67—excommunicated, 68—honours and sympathy, 69—later literary work, 72—personal habits and tastes, 73—reply to overtures from Rome, 75—death, 75—characteristics as an historian, 76—final relation to Papacy and to Old Catholics, 81—his interest in England, 81.

F

Fardell, T. G., his article on London County Council reviewed, 500.

Froude, J. A., his book on 'Divorce of Catherine of Aragon' reviewed, 201.

G

Glulstone, W. B., speech at Newcastle reviewed, 274.

Goschen, G., speech at Islington reviewed, 559.

H

Hannay, D., life of Rodney reviewed, 166. •

Hartington, Lord, speech at Manchester reviewed, 274.

I

Ice Age in North America, review of books upon, 297—conditions of ice-formation, 299—movement of glaciers, 300—rates of advance of glaciers, 302—glacial self-recorded history, 303—evidences of Glacial Epoch, 305—North American glacial deposits, 306—effects of drifts upon agriculture, 310—erosive power of ice, 311—lakes of glacial origin, 312—cataracts as glacial chronometers, 315—date of termination of ice-age, 317—bearing upon antiquity of man, 319—

astronomical hypothesis as to cause of ice age, 320—various theories considered, 324.

K

- Kipling, J. L.*, his book on 'Beast and Man in India' reviewed, 169.
Kobell, Luise von, her book on Dollinger reviewed, 18.

L

- Laguat, Francois*, review of books concerning the adventures of, 342—Mascarene archipelago, 342—early life, 344—'major' of Protestant emigrants for 'Isle of Eden,' 344—landed in Rodriguez, 345—agricultural difficulties, 347—drawbacks in the paradise, 348—recreations, 349—attempt to escape, 350—shipwreck, 351—arrival at Mauritius, 352—ill-treatment by Dutch, 352—removal to Batavia, 354—Cape Colony a hundred years ago, 354—St. Helena, 355—refuge in England, 355—fauna of Mascarene Islands, 357—the dodo, 358—present inhabitants of Rodriguez, 367.
London Municipal Administration, review of works concerning, 500—government by committees, 501—responsible executive wanted, 505—financial dangers of present system, 507—payment of executive, 511—problems for the Council, 512—abstentions at recent election, 515.
Lubbock, Sir J., his letter on Government of London reviewed, 500.

M

- Maquiolo, Viconte A.*, his book on Pozzo di Borgo reviewed, 1.
Mallet, John Lewis, review of his reminiscences, 369—character, 370—origin of his family, 371—his father, Mallet du Pan, 372—childhood, 374—visit to England, 377—in Paris during Reign of Terror, 378—life at Geneva, 378—refuge at Berne, 383—in Paris after the Terror, 385—in England again, 386—Warren Hastings, 387—refuge at Freiberg in the Breisgau, 391—invitation to England, 392—'Mercure Britannique' issued, 395—obtains a Government appointment 398—death of his father, 398.
Marbot, General, review of the memoirs of, 114—parentage, 115—early years, 116—Bonaparte's overtures to his father, 118—description of French generals, 119—death of his father, 121—at cavalry school of Versailles, 123—description of Prussian army, 125—reflections on Napoleon's system of war, 126—captaincy, 128—adventures at Eylau, 129—aide-de-camp to Murat, 130—on staff of Lannes, 131—cross of Legion of Honour, 131—invasion of Spain and pursuit of Moore, 132—siege of Ratisbon, 133—perilous feat, 135—chef d'escadron, 137—Wagram, 138—on staff of Masséna, 138—tribute to Wellington, 141—lines of Torres Vedras, 142—campaign in Portugal, 144—decline and fall of Napoleon's empire, 435—anecdotes of Masséna, 436—story of Soult, 437—invasion of Russia, 437—composition of the Grand Army, 440—Marshal Oudinot, 443—Marbot's skill as a cavalry leader, 443—General

St. Cyr, 445—battle of Borodino, 446—retreat from Moscow, 447—
 Marbot's care of his troops, 448—passage of the Beresina, 451—
 sufferings of the Grand Army, 452—Marbot a full colonel, 456—
 campaign of 1813, 457—battle of Leipzig, 462—French disasters,
 463—Waterloo, 463—exile, 469.

N

Nicholas, Sir H., his edition of 'Privy Council Proceedings' reviewed,
 145

O

Oliver, Captain P., his book on François Leguat reviewed, 312.

P

Parliament, review of the work of the present, 274—legislation and
 administration, 275—concluding session, 276—by-elections, 277—
 changes in leaderships, 278—Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain,
 279—Mr. Smith and Mr. Parnell, 281—Mr. Balfour as leader, 282
 —next election and Home Rule, 283—tactics of Opposition, 285—
 Gladstonian promises, 286—Mr. Gladstone's declaration of policy, 287
 —Newcastle programme, 291—Duke of Argyll on Home Rule
 fallacies, 292—Irish Local Government, 294—Government policy,
 294—review of present position of parties in, 359—Opposition
 without a policy, 359—Gladstonian principles not Liberal, 360—
 Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, 360—Mr. Goschen's finance, 361—
 past and prospective legislation, 362—Gladstonian tactics, 364—Mr.
 Gladstone's leadership, 364—Home Rule as an election cry, 367—
 * Mr. Chamberlain on Home Rule, 368—Mr. John Bright on Home
 Rule, 369—Gladstonian *impasse*, 372.

Pictet de Rochemont, biography by E. Pictet noticed, 398.

Plummer, A., his 'Recollections of Dollinger' reviewed, 48.

Politics, the Elements of, review of Professor Sidgwick's book on,
 81—relations of morality to government, 86—immigration of
 pauper aliens, 87—difference between moral code of mother country
 and dependencies, 88—general happiness the criterion of goodness
 of law, 89—Government interference in private affairs, 90—advan-
 tages of property, 93—interference for individual protection, 95—
 paternal legislation, 96—socialistic legislation, 97—enabling and
 disabling socialism, 98—foreign policy, 99—patriotism and humanity,
 100—international co-operation against aggression, 101—sovereignty,
 103—methods and instruments of government, 105—functions of
 parliamentary ministers, 107—advantages of second chamber, 108
 —electorate of lower chamber, 110—growth of constitution, 112.

Privy Council, the Acts of the, review of, 145—Book of the Council,
 147—collection of registers, 150—authorship of registers, 151—
 qualifications of Clerk of Council, 152—silence respecting some im-
 portant events, 153—wide range of subjects, 154—references to
 Parliament, 155—trials of Protector Somerset and his brother, 156
 —Church matters and Crown grants, 157—Princess Mary Tudor,

158 interference with trade, 158 condition of population, 161—loss of Continental possessions, 161—Ireland, 163—enforcing decrees, 161—dramatic episodes, 163.

R .

Riding and Polo, review of 'Badminton' book on, 34—'the pilot' in hunting field, 35—ideal riding, 36—national styles of horsemanship, 37—Greek horsemanship, 38—polo, 40—superiority of English horsemen, 41—breeding of the horse, 42—housing and grooming, 45—rules for good riding, 45.

Robinson, Commander, his book on Sea Service reviewed, 166.

Rockhill, W. W., his 'Land of the Lamas' reviewed, 540.

Rodney, review of Mr. Hannay's life of, 166—early days, 169—lieutenant on the 'Dolphin,' 170—in command of the 'Sheerness,' 172—appointed to the 'Eagle,' 173—victory over the French off Rochefort, 174 governor of Newfoundland, 175—marriage, 177—rear-admiral, 178—M.P. for Saltash, 179—commander-in-chief on Leeward Islands station, 180—governor of Greenwich Hospital, 181—in debt, 182—in command at Jamaica, 183—pecuniary assistance from France, 184—relief of Gibraltar, 186—naval engagements in West Indies, 190—seizure of St. Eustatius, 194—victory over French off Dominica, 197—position among English admirals, 200.

Russell, H., and *W. Gattie*, their book on the Sudan reviewed, 232.

S

Schliemann, Dr., review of Dr. Schuchhardt's account of his excavations, 399—explorations at Mycenæ, 401—discoveries at Troy, 411—armour and weapons, 411—works of art, 417—Mycenaean citadel and palace, 420—shaft-graves, 421—stelai, 423—golden vessels and seals, 424—wall decoration, 425—beehive tombs, 426—graves of the populace, 428—Tiryns, 429—Ithaca, 431—biographical sketch, 432.

Schuchhardt, Dr., his book on Schliemann's excavations reviewed, 399.

Sellers, Miss E., her translation of 'Schliemann's Excavations' reviewed, 399.

Semitic Religions, review of Dr. Robertson Smith's books upon, 325—primitive beliefs of Arabia, 327—totemism, 330—dualistic conception of nature, 332—'tribal' deities, 333—the God of the Hebrews not a tribal deity, 336—taboo, 336—animal representations of deities, 337—reason of sacrifices, 338—relations of the sexes, 339—the matriarchate, 340.

Sidgwick, Prof., his work on the Elements of Politics reviewed, 84.

Smith, Dr. R., his books upon Semitic Religions reviewed, 325.

Sudan, the, review of books upon, 232—subjugated by Mehemet Ali, 232—annexation under Ismail, 233—Egyptian garrisons, 234—mixed populations, 235—the Mahdi, 236—revolt, 237—British policy, 239—Hicks's expedition, 240—abandonment recommended

by British Government, 242—Mahdi's successes, 243—Gordon's mission, 244—Baker Pasha's disaster and Graham's expedition, 245—Gordon at Khartoum, 247—relief expedition, 250—last days of Khartoum, 251—desert column, 252—Abyssinian co-operation, 253—King John abandoned by British, 256—Mahdi's successor, 257—Arab invasion of Egypt, 258—Sir C. Warren, 259—Col. Kitchener, 260—policy of re-opening trade with Sudan, 262—Gen. Grenfell at Suakin, 264—Stanley and Emin, 265—famine, 267—Osman Digna, 268—Mahdism, 270—products, 272—solution of Sudan problem, 273.

T

Tibet, review of accounts of travel in, 540—unsuccessful attempts at exploration, 541—journey of M. Bonvalot and Prince Henry of Orleans in, 542; travelling without passports, 543; desert borderland, 544—Mr. Rockhill's expedition, 545; northern route, 546—troglodyte natives, 546—Nepalese embassy to China, 547—Tibetan domestic life, 548—polyandrous tribes, 549—position of women, 549—lamas and nuns, 550—Kokonor and Wild Yak river, 551—religious and social observances, 553—Tsaidam desert, 553—Eastern Tibet, 554—Chinese influence in Tibet, 556—from Takou to Tatsienlu and Shanghai, 558.

W

Ward, Mrs. H., her 'David Grieve' reviewed, 518.
Weir, Capt., and *J. M. Brown*, their book on Riding and Polo reviewed, 34.
Whitney, J. D., his book on Geological Climatic Changes reviewed, 297.
Wingate, Major F. R., his book on the Sudan reviewed, 232.
Wright, G. F., his book on the Ice Age reviewed, 297.

END OF VOL. CLXXV.

